

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc., with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MRUK:

H. R. 3817. A bill relating to the current payment of the individual income tax not withheld at the source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 3818 (by request). A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3819. A bill to rescind Petroleum Administrative Order No. 5 and Petroleum Directive No. 59 of the Petroleum Administrator for War relating to the transportation of petroleum products to the east coast; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3820. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3821. A bill to authorize the construction of the Pine Flat-Kings River project in California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3822. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 3823. A bill to interpret and define the term "National Guard" and to determine the Federal recognition of service therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the point-rationing system with respect to pork be suspended for 60 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 376. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3825. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3995. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the American Legion Post, No. 229, and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3996. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Heede, Jr., and 37 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3997. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3998. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3999. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 10 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4000. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of William V. Appel, of Aberdeen, Wash., and nine other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting passage of any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4001. By Mr. FLOESER: Petition of Arthur W. Bolte and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4002. Also, petition of John W. Golobic and 18 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4003. Also, petition of L. Nalibarsch and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4004. Also, petition of J. R. Johnson and 80 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4005. Also, petition of Albert Dauster and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4006. Also, petition of David S. Phelan and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4007. Also, petition of Charles A. Haase and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4008. Also, petition of Besse Conrad and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4009. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Sauerwien and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4010. Also, petition of Elizabeth M. Boyle and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4011. Also, petition of Arthur Fellman and 18 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4012. Also, petition of Charles Kratz, Jr., and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord of Hosts, who art beyond our prayers and beyond all that we ask. We have asked for a cup-full and the ocean remains, for a sun-beam and the sun abides; we rejoice that Thou givest above all that we can think. O let us clothe ourselves with spiritual strength and power that we may lift our eyes unto the hills from whence cometh our help.

Almighty God, the problems that we are to work out require the use of all our powers; O turn our way unto the Lord—the way of a pure purpose and worthy ambition. Enable us to walk in the paths of helpful service, guarding our lips, lest they speak the inadvertent word, idly spoken. "The tongue of the wise useth knowledge; death and life are in the power of the tongue." Continue to revive within us the sympathy that feels another's grief, the charity that weaves another's hope, and the love that shares another's burden and under no circumstances may we bear malice.

For another most honorable Member, faithful, honest, and true, his sun has set at the approach of eventide. Immortality—O blessed undying truth which bridges the gulf and makes the continuity of life a glorious reality. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbuton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;
 H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and
 H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of C. J. Toole;
 H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey;
 H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;
 H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; and
 H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 296. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry;
 S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.;
 S. 878. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;
 S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Dradshaw;
 S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;
 S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;
 S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;
 S. 1233. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.;
 S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;
 S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;
 S. 1372. An act to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians by authorizing the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians;
 S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;
 S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite;
 S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;
 S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;
 S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;
 S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;
 S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts;
 S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;
 S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases;
 S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; and
 S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 219):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.
Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.
Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

REAR ADMIRAL GEORGE F. HUSSEY, JR.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.
 [Mr. SHEPPARD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a short item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and also an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

INTERNED JAPANESE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members probably know, a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities has been holding hearings on the very complicated and sometimes delicate questions of the handling of Japanese in this country.

Yesterday the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Francis Biddle, appeared before our committee. There is pending before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a bill which would take away the citizenship rights of any American-born citizen who declared his loyalty to any other country. This bill, perhaps with some modification, under the views expressed by the Attorney General, would be constitutional, and I believe it would help very much in solving some of the problems with which the country is faced, and particularly our Committee on Un-American Activities.

So I commend to the Members of the House to take an interest in this bill, which is H. R. 2701. I hope the Immigration and Naturalization Committee will meet and commence hearings and bring the bill to the floor as soon as possible, because it would be helpful to have it enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REED of New York was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)
 CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein the order of the Chief of Staff, regarding the care of veterans of World War No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.
 [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for 30 minutes which was granted me for yesterday be reestablished today in whatever order it may come on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
 There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement by a former Member of the House, Hon. Maury Maverick, in connection with the proceedings of the American Prison Association. This exceeds the quota allowed and I have a statement from the printer that it will cost \$112.58. I renew my request notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
 There was no objection.

CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
 There was no objection.
 Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague from California [Mr.

J. LEROY JOHNSON brought up the matter of veterans' discharge. I had occasion on yesterday to confer with General Hines of the Veterans' Bureau, regarding this matter. He tells me there has been delay in some cases, but that he is attempting to send to the various discharge centers men from the Veterans' Bureau who are veterans themselves, to inform the discharged veteran of his rights and of the papers he should fill out and so forth. As a matter of fact, General Hines offered this suggestion, to which I am sure the Members of the House will agree. He suggested he be allowed to employ some of these discharged veterans themselves to aid. He can use four or five thousand men in the various discharge centers who would in turn take care of the returning discharged veterans.

I think it is a splendid idea and I think General Hines should be applauded by Congress for making that suggestion.

However, the quicker we pass the mustering-out bill the better this whole situation will become. This should be done immediately.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial written by Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist, appearing in the issue of that paper of December 9, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR HEROIC NURSES

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, 5 of the large hospitals of the city of Chicago are in my district together with the activities of a very well-known nursing organization known as the Visiting Nurses. The nurses from these organizations have received splendid training and many of them are serving in the forces of the Army and Navy of the United States and are piling up an enviable record in medals and citations won since the United States entered the war 2 years ago. Service nurses are recruited by the Red Cross. Two Army nurses were the first women to have received the coveted Soldier's Medal; 2 air-evacuation nurses have earned air medals; 1 Army nurse wears the Purple Heart; 5 have been awarded the Legion of Merit; and 18 Army nurses who served on Bataan are entitled to wear the special citation bar given defenders of the Philippines.

I should like at this time, as a Member of this body, to express my high admiration for the nurses serving with our armed forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

DISABLED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said that General Hines was asking for more personnel. I have been urging General Hines to ask for more personnel for weeks, yes, for months. I also asked that veterans might be given their rehabilitation in the Veterans' Administration. I also asked that contact men from the Veterans' Administration be placed in hospitals to help service men and women with their claims. As of October this year approximately 635,000 men have been given honorable discharges. Out of 158,837 claims filed for disability there were allowed only 27,825, disallowed 60,000. The cases have been rated very slowly, many have not been touched. It has worked a great hardship; it has been a very cruel thing that our disabled veterans have not at least been given a rating and an attempt made to give them their just disability dues.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder whether it is not feasible to keep these disabled veterans in the Army until their disability records are straightened out and their care arranged for.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have introduced a bill to accomplish that very purpose and I earnestly hope it will pass. They should be allowed to stay in the Army until their cases are adjusted, or be given a furlough if they are able to be out of the hospitals. I am glad to have the gentleman's support in the passage of the bill. He is always interested in the veterans.

The need for doctors and nurses is increasing rapidly. The shortage in the insurance offices and in other offices of the Bureau is acute also. It may not be General Hines' fault that he has not the necessary personnel to carry out the provisions of the laws passed by the Congress for the veterans, but it is the unescapable fault of the administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered last night at Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, including a speech recently made by the Governor of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a report on veterans' discharges.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. CHESTER O. CARRIER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER

The Honorable CHESTER O. CARRIER, Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, presented himself before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech by W. D. McAfee, Chief, Construction Materials and Tools Division, War Food Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our distinguished Speaker made a speech on the floor of the House and among other things, pleaded for unity between the United States and her allies until complete victory is ours, when we could then sit down at the peace table and attempt to work out an amiable agreement for our future course.

I feel certain that every American worthy of the name agrees with that statement. However, in yesterday's press I find these statements:

Stimson warns Nation worst is yet to come.

WILSON SEES LONG WAR

Charles E. Wilson, executive vice chairman of the War Production Board, yesterday predicted a long hard struggle lay ahead.

LORD KEYES SAYS END OF WAR IS NEAR, CALLS FOR SPLITTING OF REICH

LONDON, December 9.—Lord Keyes, admiral of the fleet, said last night the end of the war was near, without a shadow of doubt.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, cannot you see how contradictory statements made by responsible people in these two Governments will do much to create the very situation which our distinguished Speaker deplored? They cannot both be true.

These statements on the very face of them attempt to create confusion and disunity and can be used as excellent propaganda by our enemies to create disunity. They can argue that America has a long hard war because we have yet to defeat the Japs, while Great Britain's war is practically over and that she will quit once Germany is defeated and leave us to fight the Japs alone.

How will the British people respond when told by the admiral of the fleet that the end of the war is near without the shadow of a doubt and then after the collapse of Germany in 1944, as Prime Minister Churchill has indicated, those same Britishers are told they have yet to fight on against our most potent enemy.

It seems to me that if those in high places are confused and cannot agree, it is asking a little too much not to expect some confusion in the ranks.

O. W. I. has the proper letters of the alphabet but has been improperly named. It should be "Oh what inconsistency or incompetency."

DAKAN'S DREAM

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House a jingle I received from a lady who recites that she has two sons serving in the south Pacific, where they have seen plenty of Americans bathed in blood, which makes her deeply resent the puny Mr. Dakan's attitude:

DAKAN'S DREAM

It makes the statesmen cogitate

When they observe how Nippons rate.
Why, they've been asked to relocate,
To purify Ohio State.

We've always thought that State was clean.

Fine Presidents, from there, we've seen.

We just supposed they bathed—I mean

We never peeked behind the screen.

Ohio schools have won renown,

Too bad the bathtub gets them down!

But, when the Japs have moved to town,

They'll bathe the folks, from toe to crown.

And Michigan is dirty, too:

At least that is the Dakan view;

But, tell us, just what can they do

When buying bathtubs is taboo?

The lakes are cold this time of year;
But Japs "can take it" so we hear.
If Dakan's right, the time is near
When State-wide bathing will appear.

Too bad, we have to go so far

To learn how negligent we are!

The Rising Sun shall be the star

To bring our bathing up to par.

Why not put old Dakan right?

A bath, in tar, with feathers bright,

Might make one planner see the light;

And let's not wait 'til bathing night!

—Ruth Coffee Hills.

WAITSBURG, WASH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Robert Vanderpool, on renegotiation of excessive profits on war contracts, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief letter from one of the departments on Federal employees in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Thursday of next week after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and received permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Father John A. O'Brien of the University of Notre Dame. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will cost \$105. I ask unanimous consent that this may be included as a part of my remarks notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include letters from various State unemployment-compensation commissions on the subject of bridging the gap pay for veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION, CONVERSION OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS, LANDING CRAFT, AND DISTRICT CRAFT FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1544) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is merely to ascertain for information if this is not the same bill we passed on yesterday?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed H. R. 3715. The Senate passed S. 1544, a bill identical with the House bill; therefore I am asking that the Senate bill be now passed. Then both Houses will have passed the same bill (S. 1544).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if the Senate bill provides for any part of the construction by the Maritime Commission with appropriations to be charged to the Maritime Commission rather than to the Navy Department?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Senate bill provides exactly the same provisions as the House bill. The House bill permits the Navy to engage in contracts with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. CASE. With full reimbursement to the Maritime Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of the total tonnage (approximately 1,772,250 tons) now building or to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account, the Navy will reimburse the Commission in full for the cost of construction involved in the building of the small assault transports and the escort aircraft carriers in accordance with the terms of agreements which have already been effected between the two agencies. The cost to the Maritime Commission of building the balance of the tonnage is not to be reimbursed by the Navy, but, as is provided by section 2 of the bill, this cost will be borne by the Commission out of its own appropriations. It is understood that provision for such expenditures has been made in the budget which the Commission is currently presenting to Congress, and that the amount involved is approximately \$900,000,000.

Mr. CASE. That is a complete statement of the matter so far as the Maritime Commission is involved?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the gentleman that the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with the Independent Offices appropriation bill had the Maritime Commission before it yesterday. Most of the members of that committee were in hearing and among other questions this was one that was discussed. I appreciate the

gentleman's reference to the statement that was made yesterday, but the members of that subcommittee did not get it because they were working with the Maritime Commission on this question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The principal sources from which the Navy expects to obtain the 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels called for in the bill are as follows:

First. Two hundred and fifty thousand tons, already in existence, from the Army.

Second. Five hundred thousand tons, now being built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account;

Third. One million, two hundred and fifty thousand tons to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account; and

Fourth. Five hundred thousand tons, which the Navy will acquire by purchase or construction for its own account.

Mr. CASE. There will be complete reimbursement for this portion which the gentleman has described and the balance will come out of the Maritime Commission's appropriation. Now, what is the status of the ships that are paid for by the Maritime Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They belong to the Maritime Commission, as they are being paid for by that agency, but will be under the control of the Navy. They do not become Navy ships, they are Maritime Commission ships, but they will be used by the Navy so long as they are needed but the ships that the Navy pays for which are built by the Maritime Commission are Navy ships.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate having that statement as a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons, or such portion thereof as may be directed by the President of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, such auxiliary vessels, landing craft and district craft to be of such size, type, and design as the Secretary may consider best suited for the prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no sums expended by the Maritime Commission from funds appropriated to it for the construction of vessels which are transferred to the Navy shall be reimbursed from naval appropriations, except to the extent of agreements existing on the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That vessels acquired by the Navy from the Maritime Commission without reimbursement shall not be disposed of except by return to the Maritime Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the

proceedings by which the House passed the bill H. R. 3715 yesterday be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a previous unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3741, with Mr. GOSSETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, \$4,000,000; aviation facilities, \$25,000,000; storage facilities, \$20,000,000; ordnance facilities, \$60,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, \$81,200,000; shore radio facilities, \$5,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, \$800,000; miscellaneous structures, \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed \$200,000,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the object and purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish or develop naval shore activities within the continental United States by the construction of such public works as he may deem necessary.

The projects to be undertaken under the authority of this bill are fleet facilities, aviation facilities, storage facilities,

ordnance facilities, personnel training and housing facilities, shore radio facilities, Naval Research Laboratory, and miscellaneous structures. This program is intended to carry forward the needs of the Navy Department for continental public-works construction until the end of the current fiscal year. As the war progresses and the Navy expands, additional shore facilities are necessary to properly care for the Navy's needs, and this bill is designed to provide for these additional facilities.

The bill as introduced in the House limited the total cost of the projects to be undertaken to \$200,000,000. However, as the projects were investigated in detail by the committee it developed that certain additions should be made in order to properly take care of the Navy's current needs. Accordingly, the committee is recommending that the total cost be raised to a limit of \$235,060,000. This increase in cost provided for additional items as follows: \$2,000,000 for aviation facilities, \$12,000,000 for ordnance facilities, \$11,060,000 for personnel training and housing facilities, and \$10,000,000 for miscellaneous structures.

The \$2,000,000 item added to the bill by the committee under the heading of aviation facilities is to provide additional facilities in the Naval Air Transport Service, and is considered absolutely necessary in view of the continued expansion of that service in the Navy and the valuable work it is doing.

The \$12,000,000 item added to ordnance facilities provides for transportation facilities in the Puget Sound area and for storage facilities in the San Diego-San Pedro area. With the increase of naval activities in the Pacific it is considered that the increase recommended is of the utmost necessity for the storage and expeditious handling of ammunition for our ships in that area.

During the course of the hearing it developed that additional facilities were necessary in the personnel distribution centers in both the Eleventh and Twelfth Naval Districts to care for men who are held in that area awaiting transfer, or men who have been on ships lost in action and have been sent there to await further assignment or detail. The increase of \$11,060,000 in personnel training and housing facilities is for the purpose of providing proper and appropriate housing facilities for such men. Without this increase there will be housing facilities at these centers for only about 65 or 70 percent of the men whom it will be necessary to care for. The committee believes that adequate provision should be made for the personnel that have to be kept in these localities.

The \$10,000,000 increase in miscellaneous structures is to provide access facilities to Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., to the greatly expanded naval activities on the island and for access to the shipbuilding plants in the immediate vicinity of the naval activities. The present facilities are extremely inadequate and congestion is such that movement of traffic is very slow, requir-

ing an unreasonable time for the passage of traffic to and from the island.

The Navy Department fully justified to the committee the needs for all of these increases in the bill. Therefore, I ask that the Committee of the Whole House accept the amendments recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs and give approval to this public works bill.

Let me call your attention to the amendments.

The first committee amendment increases the sum authorized to be appropriated for aviation facilities by \$2,000,000 from \$25,000,000 to \$27,000,000. This increase was determined upon since the need for the additional money involved is required to construct additional facilities for the Naval Air Transport Service at or near Alameda to meet the rapidly increasing demand for facilities to handle the large increase in naval air transport operations. The money requested should be made available at this time so that the augmented facilities can be proceeded with at an early date.

The second amendment increases the funds sought by the Navy Department for ordnance facilities from \$60,000,000 to \$72,000,000 or \$12,000,000. These additional funds are required for the establishment of shipping facilities in the Puget Sound area to relieve the extremely hazardous condition now existing in the heart of the city of Seattle where high explosives to a large degree are being handled through the congested water front of the city of Seattle. The funds will be employed in the construction of an extension of the railroad from Shelton, Wash., to the vicinity of the Bremerton Navy Yard, a distance of approximately 32 miles, and the development of shipping facilities in the near vicinity to relieve the hazardous condition now existing.

The third amendment increases the funds sought by the Navy Department for housing and training facilities from \$81,200,000 to \$92,262,000 or \$11,060,000. This sum was requested in order to provide additional housing facilities in the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Naval Districts to meet the requirements imposed by the increased personnel being dispatched to the west coast for replacement crews of ships and to provide for the personnel being returned from the combat areas.

The fourth amendment increases by \$10,000,000 the sum requested by the Navy Department for miscellaneous structures, increasing the total amount requested from \$4,000,000 to \$14,000,000. This increase is to provide access facilities to Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., to the greatly expanded naval activities on the island and for access to the shipbuilding plants in the immediate vicinity of the naval activities. The present facilities are extremely inadequate and congestion is such that movement of traffic is very slow, requiring an unreasonable time for the passage of traffic to and from the island. The construction of the access facilities requested herein will materially relieve the

situation and greatly add to the efficiency both of the naval and private activities on this island.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In connection with the railroad trackage facilities referred to in the report—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is Puget Sound.

Mr. CASE. I notice a provision for building a railroad 32 miles long. Will that railroad be owned by the Navy Department or is that to be loaned or given or otherwise transferred to some private railroad for operation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say to the gentleman from South Dakota, it will be owned and operated by the Navy. The real purpose of the spur is that there will be quartered in Seattle, I suspect, hundreds of thousands of tons of ammunition on the water front, which is not only hazardous, it is dangerous. That ammunition will have to be rehandled into the yard on barges. That is dangerous. Also, all the freight that goes into the Bremerton Navy Yard. The gentleman appreciates and will realize, that the Bremerton Navy Yard, although being one of the largest in the world, has no rail connection. The rehandling costs of freight have amounted in the last 6 years to the cost of this spur and I suppose will amount to more in the future. It is something that should have been done a long time ago. All the Navy heads of yards and docks have recommended it. The Navy officials at Bremerton Navy Yard have recommended it. It will be operated by the Navy. I suspect that the use by the Navy of the spur line—it is really a spur—will continue for many, many years to come, because truly the operation at the Bremerton Navy Yard will be just as great, if not greater, in the years to come.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota and to the Committee, the policy of the Naval Affairs Committee is not to make an expenditure of this kind under any condition unless it is Government-owned and Government-operated. Now the policy goes further. Instead of going out and building on somebody else's ground and investing money, we build it on our own ground. We do not go out and take Government money and build up facilities on somebody else's property and then the Government, later on, have to turn it back to the original owner.

Mr. CASE. Then I assume the \$12,000,000 amendment proposes the acquisition of the land?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely, the right-of-way in fee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the land in between is all stumpage land? Most of it has very little relative value and there is nothing in between to build up. There is no expensive land. I do not know. My colleague from Wash-

ington can probably tell me, I suppose, that the land might be worth \$5 an acre.

Mr. CASE. Further, does the \$12,000,000 amendment propose the cost of land and the building of the track alone, or does it also include the authorization for the rolling stock which will be required to operate the railroad?

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman, in the navy yard itself we have sufficient rolling stock to take care of this spur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is the construction of the track and the building of the track, as stated by the gentleman from Washington, and the rolling stock is already sufficient in that navy yard.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the answer that the two gentlemen have given and also appreciate the statement which the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has made with respect to the policy in the acquisition of land, and I am only sorry that the Naval Affairs Committee was not able to follow out that policy in the acquisition of land where we had to build island bases around the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have a committee on that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say this. I introduced an amendment in the House at the direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the House agreed to it, that not a single lease anywhere in the United States and not a single purchase of realty by the Navy is made until it is submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs and approved by that committee. The Committee on Naval Affairs has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. MAAS, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. COLE, when Mr. MAAS cannot serve; and myself to investigate thoroughly each and every one of such items.

Today I introduced a bill giving the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House the right to veto any sale or the cancellation of a lease on any of the property that the Navy has acquired which, as the war develops, it may be necessary for the Navy to cease using, because when they go to sell this property that they have taken possession of either by condemnation or by purchase, or when they go to liquidate these plants that we have poured millions of dollars into I want the Congress to have a voice in how it is going to be disposed of.

Mr. CASE. Again I want to commend the diligence of the committee in inquiring into these properties within the United States, and to express the hope that it might be possible for the Congress in some way to assert a similar diligence with respect to the permanent interest that we may obtain in the bases we have built around the world.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman, but let us win the war before we get into a discussion of that matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said that the

Navy intended to operate these facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What facilities?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one you are going to acquire under this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We were discussing a railroad from the water front on Puget Sound to the Bremerton Navy Yard. Of course, the Navy will operate that just like it operates any naval plant.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not have any doubt at all about what you think you are going to, but what I am getting at is, What are you going to do if Tom DeLorenzo comes along and keeps the power of hiring and firing your employees?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know you are.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have just finished reading the report of the special committee on the Brewster plant. It is the most fascinating and most enlightening document that will be submitted to this Congress. It is a story almost as fascinating as you will find in the novel of the Count of Monte Cristo. I invite every Member of the House to read that account of Brewster. Then you can form your own opinion of what will happen if Thomas DeLorenzo has anything to do with the building of these projects.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can you rewrite that story so as to have a more pleasant ending?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I could.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know you could, but do you think you will have a chance?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions from any members of the Committee with reference to any phase of this bill, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in here about continuing pilot training in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. All of this is under the heading of "Aviation facilities." It is for the establishment of naval air-station facilities; the primary training; the intermediate training; the operations training.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am particularly interested in. I was wondering if the gentleman could enlighten us on what the Navy is planning to do. Do you plan to expand some of these naval training stations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is just exactly what the \$25,000,000 is for.

Mr. STEFAN. We have some in the Middle West. They are very, very successful. Is there any of that for the stations in the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will tell you where they are.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am interested in the question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for this reason: We do not have a single naval training establishment in the State of

Missouri. Some of our local people down there near the city of Cape Girardeau built with private money, a fine establishment, and they are ready to train those boys. They tell us that the program is being curtailed and they cannot furnish trainees for this institution which has been built by private capital. Here it is. "Come and get it, Uncle Sam," and they say "We cannot take it."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can only say that I hope they utilize all of these without going to the Treasury and getting more money to expand some that are already in existence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to know if this takes care of these stations.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know that particular case the gentleman has referred to. I will read it to the Committee in a minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several Members have asked me since the discussion on this bill began whether or not there is a break-down of the items. I understand the gentleman is placing that in the RECORD.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The reason we do not place it in the RECORD is this, and the reason why we do not give it out is due to this fact: the war conditions may change tomorrow and some of these places will not be built. We do not do it because the Member would have sent word out to his district that there was going to be a naval expansion costing so many hundreds of thousands of dollars, yet after a resurvey with the war situation shifting backward and forward they might conclude not to build it, in which case the Member of Congress would be in a right delicate situation. So it was decided for that reason only not to give the information. I have no hesitancy however in giving it and will be glad to give it to the Committee now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, if a Member of Congress would like to look at the break-down he can go to the Committee on Naval Affairs and they would be glad to give it to him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The distinguished chairman is really an expert on these various programs. Does he think it is wise economy on the part of our Government to go out and solicit private capital to build and expand facilities for the training of these men and then for the Government to come along and say they are reducing the program and cannot avail themselves of the facilities?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Missouri that it is not in the interest of economy and that it should not be done. If the particular place to which the gentleman has reference can be utilized it should be utilized and some of the others not expanded.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In just a moment. I want to finish with this matter first.

In the expenditure of the \$4,000,000 it is going to be necessary to locate for fleet facilities some bases either on the west coast, the Gulf coast, or the east coast. They have not been determined. If anyone wants to take that up I suggest that they do so with the Office of Naval Operations in the Navy Department.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, how about the places in the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. \$27,000,000 is planned to be expended for aviation facilities broken down in this way: In the North Atlantic area in Brunswick, Me., Squantum, Mass., Quonset Point, Charlestown, R. I., Martha's Vineyard; in the Middle Atlantic area at Lakehurst, Norfolk, and Cherry Point. In the South Atlantic area at Key West, Fla. On the West Coast at San Diego, Alameda, Santa Barbara, Seattle, Mojave, and Astoria. In the naval air primary training, facilities will be established at New Orleans, Dallas, Norman, Memphis, St. Louis, Hutchinson, Bunker Hill, Chicago, and Minneapolis.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that all of them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; there is no use putting all of these in the RECORD.

Mr. STEFAN. Are there any in there for Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma—the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will turn this document over to the gentleman to let him look at it for himself.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further, what I am interested in and what I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is interested in is whether or not aid will be extended to these institutions that have expended so much money in creating facilities and in adjusting their courses to meet this training program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. These should be utilized; we all agree with that; but it may not be possible to use all of them and they may not be able to utilize right now, all the airfields established under the civil aeronautics program, with the community furnishing the ground and the Government appropriating the money to build the airfields. The Navy gives careful consideration to each and every site available as to whether it is suitable for naval use.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, many communities built the buildings and furnished everything.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Some of them. We are taking them over day after day whenever the military needs justify it. Unless, however, there is some military need to justify it we should not establish in your district, my district, or anybody else's district any activity just because there are certain facilities there which were built by another agency when the overhead cost of operating it is way out of proportion.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am as much interested in economy and efficiency as is the gentleman from Georgia; but here are facilities available, and for the sake

of economy, if facilities are available why expand others that are not now adequate?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the simple reason that they are already in existence. As I said, not a single new field is being established. The authorities are trying to utilize those fields that Civil Aeronautics has built wherever they can be utilized.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman will certainly agree that if an existing facility is 90 percent completed it would be good economy to utilize it rather than to build another one to take its place.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are not building any new ones; we are merely expanding those already in existence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another observation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. My information is that they are building some large plants; in other words going out and building a large plant to take care of a great number of these boys, and for that reason they are taking them out of these local establishments and centralizing them in these large plants which they are expanding and building.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may happen in certain places on account of the overhead cost. You could see it would be in the interest of economy to concentrate instead of having a half dozen different small establishments, each with an overhead attached to it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. For example, this plant I am talking about is located under the dome of one of the finest colleges in our State where they can be given every facility.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that. They are not cutting down the college program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yet they are denying these people the necessary trainees to carry on.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I notice in the gentleman's bill certain facilities are to be expanded on a permanent basis. That evidently contemplates a post-war operation of such bases?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. There is nothing in here that deals with the post-war Navy requirements. After the war it might be that a great many of these bases can be used and a great many of them will not be used; but the bill is not predicated upon post-war operations at all. It is predicated upon the needs and the necessities now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no one seems to be opposed to this bill. Some of us might feel better satisfied if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the members of that committee had charge of the carrying

out of the program, and I refer not to what should be acquired or constructed or used but to the way in which the money might be spent. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was Secretary of the Navy and his committee had control of the expenditures for the Navy not a Member of the House would worry.

This bill will call for \$235,000,000, with an additional \$60,000, which is a comparatively small sum. However, that amount would buy perhaps one-third, maybe one-half, more if the money were judiciously spent.

I have read some of the testimony taken before the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs which investigated this Brewster contract. I heard the head of the union which has the power to prevent the discharge of any man or woman testify. I heard him testify that unless the planes that were being built in that factory, and the Government has some sixty-odd million dollars invested over there with orders for \$139,000,000, I heard him testify, I repeat, that unless those planes could be built under the union's interpretation of the contract with the company they would not be built at all. That is just one incident in a long series which establishes the fact that unless some of these union politicians and racketeers can have their way with the expenditure of Government money they will not support the effort of the fighting men by first creating and then taking over to them in the front lines the things which those fighting men must have if they are to survive.

Do you get the import of that? There is a man over on the fighting front. He needs a gun, or a barge is needed to land reinforcements, but as a union man I say, "You will not get it unless the employer complies with our demands as to the manner in which, the time when it shall be made, and the amount we demand be paid for it." Do you get that? That is what is being done all over this country.

Yesterday our Speaker, and we all respect him, made a wonderful talk here; called attention to dangerous trends. It was a wonderful plea for unity. Whether it was directed to the public and to the Members of the House as a whole or more especially to the members of his own party who are in revolt against the New Deal I do not know. All may well give it thoughtful consideration. Let me say now that there is no more dangerous trend in this country, there is no more dangerous situation in this country than that which exists today where men on the production and supply lines say, as they have said, as they are saying day after day, "You will not get this gun, you will not get this shell, unless you agree to our demands."

IS THIS COOPERATION WITH THE MEN ON THE BATTLE FRONTS?

It is long past time when the administration, having failed, Congress should assume the burden of seeing that the taxpayer's dollar is economically and efficiently spent. It is time that Congress

set the War Labor Board on the right track, put an end to its and the administration's coddling of certain union labor politicians; to the policy of extending to them special favors in return for political support.

Recent hearings before the Smith committee have disclosed a situation, the effect of which is a destruction of property rights, of personal rights, in utter disregard of constitutional safeguards. That, at least, is my opinion.

Because the hearings are still continuing no reference will be made to the facts disclosed, but the conclusions given above are substantiated by the reports in the daily newspapers.

Yesterday from the city of Holland, Mich., came the following telegram:

HOLLAND, MICH., December 7, 1943.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The men of the Holland Motor Express Co. and the Rooks Transfer Lines, Inc., of this city, went on strike Monday, December 6. This will tie up all of our war industries and many of them will have to shut down unless they can get immediate relief.

The issue is mileage between Muskegon and Chicago. AAA says the companies are right in their contention. Feinsinger, of the War Labor Board 1 trucking panel, concedes this fact. But on account of the companies making a temporary concession some time ago, due to the demands of the union Feinsinger decided that the companies must make this temporary concession permanent, because the companies had not consulted the War Labor Board in the matter at the time they made this temporary concession. In view of the fact that the AAA has at two different times checked up on the distance between Muskegon and Chicago, and both times their figures agree with the mileage that the companies are paying now, and that this man Feinsinger concedes the correctness of the findings of the AAA, both these companies are determined not to deviate from the original agreement made with the union, and are ready to close up shop and go out of business. Can you be of any assistance?

Respectfully yours,

HOLLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
E. P. STEPHEN, Secretary-Manager.

In reply to my inquiry, this morning I received a telegram which states that the American Automobile Association, after two check-ups, gives the mileage between Muskegon, Mich., and Chicago, Ill., as 178 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

The union which went on strike in Holland, Mich., on Monday, December 6, and which will close plants engaged in war production, unless material flows freely, states that the distance is 183 miles.

Sometime ago the companies involved made a temporary concession and paid union men on the basis of 183 miles. Now a Mr. Feinsinger, the War Labor Board representative, holds that because of this temporary agreement between the companies and the union, which was made without the knowledge or consent of the War Labor Board, the companies must now pay the union on the basis of 183 miles, although the actual distance is no more than 179.

The purpose of the union is to have the mileage fixed at a figure over 180 miles for then the companies would have to pay on an 8-hour basis instead of a 6-hour basis. That makes a difference

of \$1.11 per trip each way and means something like \$15,000 or \$20,000 per year additional wage cost for the companies, which inevitably will be passed on to the Government and added to the cost of munitions program.

What shall be said of the men who at home live in a peaceful community, presumably sleeping in comfortable beds, and enjoying three meals per day, refuse to aid in producing materials of war needed by the men who are on the fighting front, because they are not paid \$1.11 per day—\$1.11 which they do not earn, for which they do not render any service and which in part must be paid by the returning soldiers.

The War Labor Board takes the position that inasmuch as Congress authorized it to settle labor disputes involving war production, that even though Congress requires that those disputes be settled without disregarding the provisions of the N. L. R. A., it still has absolute authority to make any order which it thinks necessary in order to settle a dispute. To illustrate, if these men on strike demanded that they be paid \$5 or \$10 additional per day as a condition precedent to working in a munitions factory, the Board or the Regional Director, Mr. Feinsinger, might order the company to make payment. That the A. F. of L. intends to have its way is shown by a telegram just received, which reads as follows:

HOLLAND, MICH.,
December 9, 1943.

Employees of the striking companies have been ordered by the A. F. of L. to keep away from the property of the companies and if anyone of them are found talking to the managers of the companies they will be fined \$100.

E. P. STEPHAN,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

It is time that Congress passed a bill, similar to the one I introduced sometime ago, providing that when men engaged in war production refuse to work in war production, they automatically, regardless of age or physical condition, be inducted into the Army, at Army pay and by the commanding officer of the district in which they live, be assigned to a job deemed by the commanding officer as essential to the war production at soldier's pay.

The policy of appeasement, of extending special privileges in return for political support should be ended.

When men on the supply line, because they do not receive \$1.11 for work which they did not perform, refuse to keep flowing the shells, the fighting tools needed by the men on the fighting line, it is time for all Americans to stop, think, and then act.

Mr. Chairman, if that was the only instance we might pass it by, but that is typical of the whole set-up. When you go to spending \$235,000,000 you are not going to get \$235,000,000 worth of results if that procedure continues.

Here is a clipping taken from either last night's paper or this morning's paper in connection with a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs. A Burlington, N. C., firm had \$63,000,000

of United States contracts and they spent \$30,000,000 to get one plane. That is the report of the investigator of that committee. The report states they borrowed 50 skilled workers from an East St. Louis firm to which they paid \$48 a man per day for their services.

Here is another letter from a paper company up in my district. I have had this up before. They are engaged in making paper cartons for ration boxes, for shell containers, and similar articles. They are compelled to slow down and on some days to close down. Why? Because they cannot get waste paper. Why can they not get waste paper? Because of the black-market operators in Chicago. How do I know that? The O. P. A. writes me a letter and they tell me over the phone, the O. P. A. tells me that the black-market operators are doing business, that the O. P. A. is after them. This came up first way back last April, and this is December.

This company, as just stated, wanted this waste paper to make cartons for shells and ration boxes for the boys in the service. They cannot get it because a bunch of crooks in Chicago are operating a black market on waste paper. When I got the O. P. A. run into its hole, it said, "We have had it up before the grand jury in Chicago," and they did. Our company furnished them with evidence, and the O. P. A. said, "Well, these men have been indicted, but the indictment is being held up by the United States attorney in Chicago." Their phrase was, "He is sitting on it." The United States district attorney is charged by the O. P. A. with sitting on an indictment which would end the practices of black-market operatives on the waste-paper market which prevent the manufacture of boxes that the boys need to carry their food in. Can you conceive of any worse situation? Yet there it is.

The Speaker of the House can talk about dangerous trends. I am telling you there are many of them, many of them. The administration's habit of coddling Lewis and labor politicians is one of the most dangerous trends. The new Member who came in this morning from a Kentucky district normally Democratic does not happen to be a dangerous trend. It happens to be one which points the way toward—what do you call it?—a revival of American spirit and American principles. I hope the apparent trend toward repentance is real, lasting, and sincere.

I will talk about other dangerous trends in a few days. There are many of them. But most of them will, if the change shown in recent elections continues, be nipped in the bud.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the

construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, \$4,000,000; aviation facilities, \$25,000,000; storage facilities, \$20,000,000; ordnance facilities, \$60,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, \$81,200,000; shore radio facilities, \$5,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, \$800,000; miscellaneous structures \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed \$200,000,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000."

Line 4, strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$72,000,000."

Line 5, strike out "\$81,200,000" and insert "\$92,260,000."

Line 8, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000."

Line 12, strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$235,060,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOSSETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SOLDIERS' ABSENTEE VOTING BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is so much misleading criticism and misleading propaganda being spread concerning the soldiers' absentee voting bill, which I am supporting, and which passed the Senate last week, that I am going to urge every Member of the House to get a copy of it and read it carefully between now and Monday. You will see that it provides a constitutional way for the men in our armed forces to vote, and leaves the election machinery in the hands of the States, where it belongs.

Of course, it is opposed by PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, which is often referred to as the worst enemy the Jewish people of this country ever had. You often hear it said that PM and Walter Winchell are doing more to stir up anti-Semitism in this country than any other paper or broadcaster ever known. They continue to malign Members of Congress, both House and Senate, and to misrepresent them about this measure.

As a result, I am getting a flood of correspondence from New York about this measure. Some of it is most offensive, and even filthy; and all of it shows gross ignorance of, or disregard for, the facts. Most of it seems to be the result of advertisements which PM has been running, calling on its readers to write members of this committee against this bill.

This measure provides the only way for the soldiers and sailors and members of the Marine Corps to vote legally by absentee ballots. Every State in the Union is now ready to cooperate to the fullest extent. This bill provides for aid of the War and Navy Departments in getting these ballots to the men in the service and getting them back, and giving them free air-mail services going and coming. Anyone who opposes the passage of this measure is simply opposing the only method for enabling these men in our armed forces to vote at all.

A few days ago I inserted a list of the names of people who had written me opposing this bill the day before. Because of their names, the Communist paper, PM, which, as I said, is doing the Jewish people more harm than any other publication in America, came out and accused me of anti-Semitism.

For that reason I am inserting the names and addresses of the ones who wrote me the next day. Many of their letters are duplicates. These people have simply been misled, or else they have no regard for our American form of constitutional government.

Here are the names and addresses of the ones who wrote me on December 8 in opposition to this bill:

B. Marcein, Bronx; E. S. Blamo, H. M. Reuben, Aaron L. Rochman, J. M. Grohol, New York City; Florence Freidman, Newark, N. J.; Mrs. Ray Grodon, A. S. Rothschild, N. R. Scheutz, Ruth Scheutz, New York City; Jeanette Weiser, Bronx; A. Gottsman, Army; Helen Smenka, Brooklyn; Fannie W. Halpern, Forest Hills; Harold Weiss and family, Bernard Lerner, Brooklyn; Mark K. Daniel, Anna Harkavey, New York City; Miriam Groden, Washington, D. C.; Florence Mansowitz, Mrs. L. Flatow, Mr. Heran, Brooklyn; Ruth Nash, New York City; Max L. Diamond, Long Island City; Mr. and Mrs. B. Sedan, Jacqueline Warshauer, New York City; Mary Tiner, Brooklyn; Don Luger, Coast Guard; Sophie M. Blinken, John T. Hamer, Doris J. Dirmfeld, M. L. White, New York City; Dorothy K. Funn, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. I. D. Kapnik, Brooklyn; Harry Davis, Bristol, Pa.; Hilda P. Sharin, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Harry Schenkman, Charles Kondia, Brooklyn; Florence Wishlow, Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Anita Hoecker, Jersey City, N. J.; Charity Melcher, Chambersburg, Pa.; Mrs. Mortimer Salinger, New York City; Georgiana Sheldon, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Munger, Saugatuck, Conn.; Harry Menkin, Brooklyn; Harold Marley, Lawrence, Mass.; Gertrude I. Weintraub, Brooklyn; Sgt. L. Roemer, Washington, D. C.; Otto R. Dempewolf, Brooklyn; Alice Belkin, New Haven; Maude Brenner, Washington, D. C.; Elias Kogan, Florence Maier, Brooklyn; Stanley Gole, Yonkers; Oliver C. Drake, Ramsey, N. J.; R. B. Lange, Philadelphia, Pa.; R. E. Schneider, New York City; M. Cogan and family, Sam Beckman, Beatrice Golub, Brooklyn; Alex Smith, Gertrude Rosenthal, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Stern, New York City; Mrs. Rebecca Crouch, Mrs. Schneider, Brooklyn; Rose L. Durst, New York City; E. Snyder, Brooklyn; Frank Scharnberger, St. Louis; Miss E. Weinstock, Brooklyn; Rita J. Kane, unknown; Evelyn R. Mehlman, New York City; Laura Wog, Brooklyn; Lillian Vallinsky, Bronx; Isabelle Stone, Seton Eversley, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Sanchez, Bronx; Abraham Neustadter, Army; Minna C. Gabriel, Albert Sharbart, A. Ramirez, Helen Lishner, Brooklyn; G. D. Yeager, Pittsburgh; Marguerite Wiznia, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the Polish Premier on the Teheran Agreement, that was released through the Polish telegraph agency of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on the Year of Victory by Admiral William F. Halsey, distributed by the Associated Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE LAWRENCE LEWIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members to attend the funeral of Mr. Lawrence Lewis, the following Members of the House: Messrs. CHENOWETH, ROCKWELL, DELANEY, and BROWN of Ohio.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 378) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ROBERT F. ROCKWELL, of the State of Colorado be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

WILLIAM A. PIXLEY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 194, a private claim, be referred from the Committee on Accounts to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to take a back seat for anyone in my anxiety, and in my daily prayers for a united effort, that the war might be successfully concluded at the earliest possible date, and that the men and women in the armed services whose lives are spared may return to their loved ones and this wonderful country of ours. But I also pray that we may have unity of purpose in our faith in our Constitution and our representative form of government.

The dictionary defines "unity" as follows: "State of being one; harmony; accord; continuity without deviation or change, as in purpose or action."

Unity, to me, does not mean making myself subservient to, or standing idly by and letting any individual or group undermine our Government, for which so many brave men have sacrificed their lives.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; I have always stood, I stand now, and I will always stand for a unity built upon the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe in a false unity as professed by the Nazis, Fascists, Communists, and their fellow travelers in this country. Let us not forget it was the Communists who did everything they

could think of to hinder the strengthening of the national defense of our Army and Navy, by sabotaging the defense industries in the United States until June 21, 1941. This may be only a temporary unity.

These Communists and fellow travelers, who are employed in many agencies of our Government, and whose every purpose and ideas are inimical to our form of government, should be removed from the Federal pay rolls and removed at once. However, the root of this evil lies in the department or agency of the Government that approves the appointment of these crackpots.

No greater warning could be given the American people today than that given by Jesus Christ in the closing sentences of His Sermon on the Mount, when He admonished the people, as reported by Matthew, chapter 7, verse 15. I quote:

Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravaging wolves.

America is at the cross roads. Warning signals are out. We may shortly find ourselves in the midst of the wreckage of what was once the world's greatest republic. We may find in its place, a Marxist, totalitarian dictatorship. Liberty, freedom, and justice will have perished. The world's greatest bloodless revolution will have taken place, because the people either did not care, or they were so mentally lazy they had no desire to find out, or so blindly followed one man for political reasons, as the people of their country are being led step by step to the ruination of our republican form of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a giant conspiracy going on in this country, spearheaded by the Communist Party of America, to overthrow our Government by infiltrating their members and fellow-travelers into the various departments and agencies of our Government. The technique is: After one of the followers of Karl Marx obtains a position in a key department, they do everything possible to establish a working nucleus by getting not only additional party members within that agency, but others who show signs of being gullible to their influences and machinations.

One of their most frequently used methods is to frame a fellow employee who is a nonbeliever in their theories, whereby he loses his job, thus creating a vacancy into which one of their believers can be placed.

While it is highly desirable to eliminate every single subversive from the Federal pay roll, this does not cure the situation, because in most cases this individual is only one of a group. In addition, this individual is more than likely to turn up in some other department of the Government.

What is so pitiful is, there seems to be no concern among those in high places in the administrative branch of our Government, to as much as raise a finger to bring about a remedy of this alarming situation, but on the contrary these elements are defended and protected.

Today I am talking about this situation as it relates to the Office of War Information. This is the propaganda agency of our Government, which officially presents our views to the world, and was set up under Executive order by our President. I fully appreciate and understand the value of propaganda, as one of the most potent factors in psychological warfare. But I believe it should be administered strictly from an American point of view, and not to promote an ideology foreign to our Constitution and our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, on November 4, 1943, when the House had under consideration the request for a deficiency appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the Office of War Information, I introduced House Resolution 344, which authorizes the creation of a special committee, designed to carry through a thorough investigation of the Office of War Information, for the purpose of eliminating these dangerous elements in the personnel of that agency.

It is my sincere belief, from information which I have, that a thorough investigation of the Office of War Information will, among other things, disclose the following facts:

First. The Office of War Information maintains in New York, their Foreign Languages Division, from which short-wave overseas broadcasts by radio are made to foreign countries. An investigation will verify the fact that the personnel in these offices is overloaded and topheavy with aliens, Communists, and fellow-travelers who subscribe to an ideology that is inimical to our form of Government, and the avowed purpose of which is to destroy it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Along the line that the gentleman has been suggesting as to the technique which they have employed to entrench themselves in the Government, you might go further and say they have also attempted to smear individual Members of Congress and the Congress itself as a body and to destroy the faith of the American people in their form of government.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Illinois is making a real contribution to Americanism in exposing subversive influences within our Government.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his complimentary remarks.

Second. The men in charge of obtaining the personnel for the Foreign Languages Division of O. W. I., have utterly disregarded the possibility of employing people of foreign extraction who have lived in this country for many years, are capable and well qualified for this work, and whose patriotism is beyond reproach.

Third. Aliens have been employed, notwithstanding the fact that it is absolutely impossible to check and investigate their background.

Fourth. Application forms prepared by the Civil Service Commission are not of a nature that require aliens to disclose sufficient information regarding their past history.

Fifth. The morale of patriotic employees is extremely low, due to the policy pursued by certain individuals who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out the policy of the O. W. I. This policy has caused certain employees to resign and seek employment elsewhere. With this thought in mind, I could not help but wonder what prompted four key men to resign from the London office of O. W. I., as reported in last night's edition of the Washington News.

Sixth. The salaries paid many employees are far above what the majority of these employees ever made before in their lives, and probably more than they will ever make again.

Seventh. Even after various subversives have been removed from the pay roll of O. W. I., these subversives are allowed to return and visit with their friends in the offices of O. W. I. This practice should be stopped.

Eighth. Attempts on the part of officials in O. W. I. have been made to retain employees on the pay roll, even after their subversive activities were known.

Ninth. There are many people holding jobs in the Office of War Information with civil-service ratings, when they could not possibly pass the civil-service examinations for which they are graded.

Tenth. Undesirable employees are retained on the pay roll and cannot be discharged, because a final investigation report and findings are not made by the Civil Service Commission within 1 year.

Eleventh. The recorded salaries of employees, as listed in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee of the House, does not reflect the true situation. This only indicates the annual salaries at which the employees are carried on the roll, and does not account for overtime pay, which in many cases amounts to a considerable sum. I therefore suggest that the Appropriations Committee call for a list of salaries actually paid, rather than salaries at which these employees are carried on the books.

Twelfth. The offices of O. W. I. have not only been used to propagandize the public in behalf of the policies of the New Deal, but their broadcasts to foreign countries do not reflect the true sentiments and philosophies of the overwhelming majority of the American people, and I doubt the Department of State.

Thirteenth. Propaganda favorable to the cause of communism has been injected into foreign broadcasts.

Fourteenth. The O. W. I. broadcasts have emphasized on certain occasions, the second front, which does not coincide with the strategy and policy up until now of those charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war.

Fifteenth. The Appropriations Committee is not in a position to accurately advise the Congress on the activities of O. W. I., due to the lack of an investigating staff for this work. As a consequence, many activities of O. W. I. which

should be made known to Congress are not, because the officials of O. W. I. are more concerned with keeping information from Congress rather than exposing their skeletons in the closet. Therefore I say in all seriousness, the only way Congress will ever know the true facts is to authorize the creation of a special committee to investigate the whole situation.

Several more items should be added to this list, all of which should be thoroughly aired and investigated. While I question seriously whether the establishment of the Office of War Information was wise, nevertheless at this stage of the war it should probably not be abolished. I do believe, however, that the Congress of the United States should make a determined attempt to clean house in this agency, and without delay get rid of all the undesirable subversives on the pay rolls.

It is agreed that propaganda has its place in our present-day warfare. But if the officials of the O. W. I., our propaganda agency, will not heed the advice of the Congress regarding this housecleaning job, it would be far better if the agency be completely eliminated, and the State, War, and Navy Departments take over the propaganda job, rather than have it continue along the line it is operating at present.

This situation should not be considered as a party proposition in the least, for we are all equally concerned. I am sure the Members on both sides of the aisle who put country above party, are anxious to know the full, true facts regarding this agency, in order to determine what should be done in the best interests of our country. There is absolutely no other way to ascertain these facts than by a thorough, complete investigation of the entire agency.

Judging from the hundreds of letters coming to my office, evidently I do not stand alone in my ideas regarding this subject matter; but it would not make a particle of difference. My convictions in this matter are firm and resolute.

I refuse to waver in this fight that I believe to be patriotic and righteous, and I ask all patriotic lovers of freedom and liberty to join with me in this fight for God and country.

I trust the Rules Committee will report favorably at an early date my resolution authorizing a special committee to make this investigation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes on the subject of military highways.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SMELL OF OIL

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, when, on the floor of this House in April of 1942, I declared "oil is going to play a very prominent part in this war," I did not go far enough.

I should have said "oil is going to decide this war."

Had I known then what I know now, I could have added that the production of this vital oil was going to be so manipulated that the big producers would drive every independent in the oil industry out of business.

That is absolutely the tragic situation we are approaching.

THE DILEMMA OF THE INDEPENDENT IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

Unless the present trend, the present manipulations, are halted the independent is going to be the forgotten man. Forgotten, that is, unless some historian reminds the coming generations that this same man was responsible for the discovery of more than 75 percent of our Nation's known oil fields—that this same daring enterpriser, the person who risked his own capital to give us a petroleum-propelled economy for half a century, was finally ground out of existence by the greed and avariciousness of the major oil companies.

ELKINS ACT CASES

I was first aroused over this oil matter after I made a thorough study of the suits known in the Department of Justice as the Elkins Act cases.

To go back for a moment:

On April 8, 1938, there was filed with the Attorney General of the United States a complaint alleging violation of the rebate sections of the Elkins Act by the common carrier pipe lines.

The act, as you well know, is most stringent in its provisions forbidding the giving, granting, accepting, or receiving rebates by any means or device whatsoever in connection with the shipment of oil via pipe lines.

It will be recalled that the immense growth of the Standard Oil Trust was due almost entirely to rebate manipulation. In those days it was a rebate from the railroads. The suits I speak of had to do with pipe lines, but the same principles—or should I say lack of principles?—are involved.

Preparation of the suits began.

REBATES ON SHIPMENT OF OIL VIA PIPE LINES

They were against three great companies—namely, the Standard Oil of Indiana, Phillips Pipe Line Co., and Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.

Almost immediately there were disturbing rumors heard. Knowing sources predicted that the cases would never go to trial but would be settled by consent decree.

When advised of this, Attorney General Biddle wrote in a letter:

It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

That was the promise of the Department of Justice.

Knowing of the promise, I felt better about the entire matter.

It appeared that these great concerns, despite their millions upon millions of dollars, were to be treated like any other person or corporation; that there was not one law for them, another for you and me.

But what happened?

You know the history as well as I do.

No proposed settlement was ever submitted to a committee of Congress.

CASES MYSTERIOUSLY SETTLED WITHOUT TRIAL

Cases which, had they gone to trial, might very well have resulted in penalties aggregating \$3,000,000,000 were settled overnight.

And I mean overnight—settled in 24 hours.

Overnight not only 3 companies arranged settlements, but 18 others jumped aboard the benevolent bank wagon—engineered by whom? The major oil companies? The Department of Justice?

The answer remains as much a mystery today as it did then.

Judge Pine, the Federal district judge before whom the consent decree was taken, upon grasping the import of the documents, was heard to remark: "Ah, the Christmas spirit I perceive." That was December 1941.

PARTIALITY TO THE OIL MONOPOLY

As we near another Christmas 2 years later the same spirit of favoritism for the major oil companies continues.

Big red apples in the form of special treatment go to the majors; to the independents, ashes.

How long are we in Congress going to allow this Santa Claus spirit to continue? How much longer are our people going to remain complacent?

We have all—every one of us—witnessed this special treatment for the major oil companies.

Our constituents have complained about it.

Some of our more courageous Federal officers have called it to our attention.

And our own congressional committees have reported to us on it.

Still nothing happens.

WHEN WILL CONGRESS ROUSE ITSELF

Still, it appears, the major oil companies remain greater than the people—more powerful than our own Federal officers—and, they practically sneer at a congressional committee's report.

Two years ago Members of Congress were circularized with a then almost unbelievable document entitled "Basic Objectives."

Under the cloak of war the capture of the oil industry was being planned.

Look it up in your files. I have my copy here before me. Let me read the way and means which were planned to attain the major oil company Basic Objectives."

BASIC OBJECTIVES

Even if no legislation be passed specifically aimed to bring about the necessary national adjustment and coordination of the oil industry—

Let me call your attention to their clever choice of words. I continue—

there are at hand ways and means whereby the Federal Government could bring about most, if not all of such coordination. Were the President to create and appoint a national defense coordinator for oil and a joint Government-industry board to assist and advise—

Get that "assist and advise"—

the coordinator, the vast majority of the individual units in the oil industry—

That vast majority of individual units they speak about is just another way of saying the independents—

would find themselves in no position to decline to comply voluntarily with the requests of the coordinator—

The coordinator who is to get his assistance and advice from the board. I continue—

and the board.

The board, of course being the joint Government-industry committee—

The natural disinclination—

I am again reading from the Basic Objectives—

to oppose in any way the national defense program—

Here the package is wrapped in the folds of the flag—

coupled with fear of drastic Federal legislation, would be quite sufficient to cause compliance in almost all cases.

Should these pressures be not quite enough, Basic Objectives cleverly suggested the use of priority control of needed materials, the commandeering of transportation facilities and blacklisting of any alleged offenders of the proposal to coordinate.

INDEPENDENTS FACING EXTINCTION

Since the advent of this plan we have seen many of the independents coordinated right out of business.

Under our respective noses we have had our powers, the powers of Congress, coordinated to and by the Petroleum Administrator for War.

And, the Coordinator, or Petroleum Administrator for War, is being advised.

The Board, let me assure you, has taken on a very warlike—a very patriotic sounding name.

The Board—is no simple sounding committee—the Board, the advisers, call themselves the Petroleum Industry War Council.

Now, this Petroleum Industry War Council, by the fine sound of its name, you would think, was engaged primarily in warring on Hitler and Hirohito. You would think that.

It is my belief it would be more aptly named if it were called the Petroleum

Industry Council of Major Oil Co. Executives Concerned With Making War on the Independents.

Why do I suggest that name?

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY WAR COUNCIL A CREATURE OF THE MAJORS

Well, get a copy of the roster of its officials. It is a blue book of major oil company executives.

And, let me remind you, this Beard advises, if you please, with one Ralph K. Davies, who is still drawing his magnificent salary as vice president and director of the Standard Oil Co. of California. Mr. Davies is the Assistant Petroleum Administrator for War. However, he is more often the Acting Director, Mr. Ickes' multiple duties being what they are.

Can you imagine this Board, composed largely of major oil-company officials, doing anything, advising anything, against the best interests of the major oil companies?

Can you imagine the acting Coordinator-Administrator, vice president of the California Standard Oil Co., agreeing to any suggestions or advice against the best interests of his powerful company?

It is but trying your patience when I make such a query, yet these are the conditions we face today in the oil industry.

None of us can plead ignorance.

As recently as October 5, of this very year, one of our most capable interim committees of the House Committee on Naval Affairs reported its findings.

WHAT COORDINATION MEANS

This report on the petroleum situation, written by the honorable chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS; F. EDWARD HEBERT; GEORGE J. BATES; and WILLIAM H. WHEAT, shows what all this coordination between the Board and the Coordinator is about.

It appears, from this able report, there is entirely too much coordination going on.

HOUSE COMMITTEE IS CRITICAL

The report states, and I read from it:

The Petroleum Administration for War was criticized by nearly every witness who appeared before the subcommittee for its bungling, its inexcusable delay in acting on applications for rights granted by regulations, its lack of a broad Nation-wide knowledge of the oil industry, and its favoritism to the large oil companies, whose employees predominantly man the Petroleum Administration for War—

The committee, searching honestly, diligently, for the facts, could hardly have come up with any other conclusion.

The report continues:

to assist him in regulating the petroleum industry, the Administrator has set up an innumerable number of committees in each of the five districts into which the country has been divided. Such committees are composed of industry members, most of whom are connected with major oil companies. These committees are entirely too numerous and much delay and confusion have been caused by their overlapping authority. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the subcommittee that these committees have been entrusted with too much power—

Power, I might interject, which Congress never intended they should have—and they have been biased in their exercise of this power in favor of the major oil companies.

Thus—

The report continues—

there has been a discrimination against the weaker independent members of the industry.

And how did this discrimination come about?

The report gives the answer in plain, understandable English.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE INDEPENDENTS

The majors have been able to discriminate against the independents and favor the majors under the guise of furthering the war effort.

There you have it.

Basic objectives are no longer objectives—they are realities. The plan is in operation now.

The fine coordination of basic objectives has brought it into being.

And how?

Well, because of the war.

While you and I may be primarily concerned in winning the war it seems that a great segment of our oil tycoons want first to kill off the independents—Hitler and Hirohito can wait—even though it may cost the lives of a few hundred thousand young men, more or less, why get excited. Let us get rid of the independents—we can do it now—under the guise of furthering the war effort—to-morrow may be too late. "Tomorrow may be too late if the war ends too soon," is what they are really saying.

And—they are throwing it into the very teeth of every Member of Congress.

MAJORS ARE MAKING HAY

And we are taking it.

Taking it while the majors—under the guise of furthering the war program—make war on the independents and increase their hold on the oil empire of America.

The Standard Oil Co. of California, and its United States Navy deal for the exploitation of the Navy's great oil reserve out at Elk Hills in California, is another example—if another be needed.

THE LATEST ELK HILLS DEVELOPMENTS

Briefly, 1 year ago the United States Navy, which owns two-thirds of this great oil field, and the Standard Oil Co. of California, its neighbor, owning one-third of the field, agreed to go into business together.

But Navy, owning two-thirds or more of the field and with untouched oil reserves, gave to Standard, the one-third owner, complete control of the field.

When some of us, even though we hazarded the chance of being branded with deterring the war effort, questioned the merits of the arrangement, the Department of Justice again appeared in the oil picture.

This time, however, I am happy to report with results unlike the Elkins Act episode.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL LITTELL ENTERS THE SCENE

Norman M. Littell, Assistant Attorney General, and one of the most courageous men in Government service I have ever known, was, because of his position, called upon to give his opinion of the deal. This he did—honestly and fearlessly and without the coordination or suggestions or advice from any petroleum industry war council or board.

Mr. Littell did not even check with the Acting Petroleum Administrator for War, Ralph K. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, a party to the contract.

Handicapped though he may have been, his memorandum—which I am certain all Members of Congress have seen by this time—declared, simply: "The contract is illegal and void."

Handicapped, perhaps, because he was not controlled by the coordinative spirit, lacking perhaps, a Santa Claus perspective, Mr. Littell gave only his clear, concise legal opinion.

That was that the arrangement was "illegal and void."

The ink was hardly dry on his memorandum when the Standard Oil Co. officials bestirred themselves from their financial fox holes and the Navy trained their best legal brains and blasted salvos at the Assistant Attorney General.

Under the guise of furthering the war effort—here appeared easy prey—a pot shot—a sitter.

The Standard officials prated patriotism, while the Navy issued a 50-page tome of praise for the contract.

In response to my request for the names of the authors of the Navy's 50-page document of praise of their deal with the Standard Oil Co. of California, which was unsigned, Adlai E. Stevenson, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, has given me that information.

THE NAVY LAWYERS UPHOLD ELK HILLS CONTRACT

In his letter to me, in which he states the document was hurriedly prepared, he lists the names of nine individuals who assisted in its preparation.

Nine attorneys on the one side—only Mr. Littell defending the people's side.

From the past associations of these gentlemen—understand, I make no charge against their honesty, their sincerity or their ability—but from the record of their past experiences, as given me by the assistant to the Secretary of the Navy—it appears they all are of the "board member" type.

I give you their names:

Mr. Keith R. Kane, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy and former member of the New York City law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft.

Mr. Warren J. Dale and Mr. David T. Searls, members of the Houston, Tex., law firm of Vinson, Elkins, Weems & Francis.

Lt. Carl McGowan, who in civilian life has been connected with the legal firms of Debevoise, Stevenson, Plimpton & Page, New York City, and Gardner, Carnton & Douglas in Chicago.

Rear Admiral H. A. Stuart, director of the Navy's office of Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Commander Victor Wilhelm, in civilian life the chief petroleum engineer of the Texas Co. in California.

Commander Harry Stolz, member of the Los Angeles engineering firm of Stanley & Stolz. Both commanders are on Admiral Stuart's staff.

Research assistance, according to the Navy's letter to me, was given by Lt. Richard G. McClung, formerly associated with the New York City law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Gardiner & Reed, and John E. Shatford, president of the Shatford Trade & Transport Co. of El Dorado, Ark. Mr. Shatford, the letter states, is "a practical oil man of long experience" and he assisted them on the economic aspects of the oil industry.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman is giving the names of the attorneys who drew up the first contract between Standard Oil and the Navy in regard to Elk Hills?

Mr. COFFEE. I am giving the names of the 9 distinguished lawyers who composed the 50-page tome in which they took issue with Mr. Norman Littell, Assistant Attorney General, who declared that the contract was illegal and void. The Navy came back with a 50-page brief in which it insisted the contract was valid and binding and was justifiable and meritorious.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on getting that information. I asked who drafted the Elk Hills contract with the Navy in a hearing before the Committee on Public Lands and I could not find out who had drafted that contract.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman very much. I think the Committee on Public Lands has done a signal service in pointing the torchlight of publicity at this deal. We hope that an improvement will eventuate as a result of these investigations and that a new arrangement will be entered into whereby the Government will either own the entire field or operate it for itself and have complete control of the operation.

Note well that when the Navy wanted information on the economic aspects of the oil industry about a case in California they took the advice of a man from Arkansas—all, I suppose, in order to further the war effort.

NO INDEPENDENTS CONSULTED

Note well, according to the Navy's own record of these men, not a single person was a California independent oil operator.

What was the reason for this?

I will not presume to answer for the Navy.

However, I would like to know why when it came time—although they say they were rushed in the preparation of the memorandum—to delve into the economic aspects they went to Arkansas instead of California. Elk Hills after all is in California—not Arkansas.

Commander Victor Wilhelm, one of the consultants, is a Californian, a major oil company executive, a man who was the chief petroleum engineer of the Texas Co. in California.

The Texas Co. in California, I am told, works in complete harmony with the Standard Oil Co. of California. Furthermore they are partners in the development of certain oil fields in the Far East.

I can only venture the mildest form of a guess as to the reasons for the exclusion of a California independent oil operator in these hurried consultations and that is—they did not want any independent advice.

But, regardless of all the experts, the Littell opinion stands to this day.

NEW CONTRACT BEING ARRANGED

But, a new arrangement has been made.

A temporary agreement was entered into on September 8. It provides that a new, shall I say "contract," must be written within 90 days.

By the way, that agreement has just been temporarily renewed for another brief period until the committees of Congress can act on the whole proposition which has been thrown into our laps by the recent joint act of the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy, about which you may have read in the newspapers yesterday.

So, sometime along about the jolly, festive yuletide season, when our hearts are filled with love and charity for our fellow man, I imagine a new contract will be proclaimed, and with as little fanfare as possible.

I predict it will be a legal contract—a contract neither Mr. Littell nor any other attorney of equal ability may attack upon its legality or validity technically, no matter how much such attorneys may disapprove of the same as an expression of public policy.

I may even say it will be a coordinated contract, since all concerned will have been given ample opportunity to make it so.

However, I further predict that, though covered with legal verbiage, the gracious, generous sentiments of the Christmas spirit will be contained therein, and legally.

Standard Oil of California, I am certain, showing the usual disdain for Congress, will end up with the control of this vast oil reserve which belongs to all the people of the United States.

This, they will throw in our teeth.

Or perhaps the coordinators may, too, take unto themselves some of the spirit of Christmas and withhold the announcement of the new proposition until we are recessed; at home before our own yule log where the whole affair may be overlooked.

I wrote this speech before the latest development occurred a few days ago, in which the Secretary of the Navy brought up his proposition before the respective committees of Congress, Naval Affairs, and Naval Appropriations. I am hopeful and much more optimistic than at the time this speech was composed, that

Congress may have something to say, now, which will correct the sad situation yet obtaining with respect to Elk Hills.

Gentlemen, these are but a few of the fundamental facts which revolve about the entire oil picture.

The war is first to make war on the independents.

That is the reason we are in the serious position today.

STRANGLING THE OIL INDEPENDENTS

The independents are being strangled. They have not had the opportunity to throw their full force into the oil battle—the battle to supply the vital petroleum products so necessary to defeat Hitler and Hirohito.

The enemy immediately in front of them is the major oil companies.

They cannot get at our military opponents until they can climb over the bodies of their opponents in their own industry—the major oil companies.

And, gentlemen, they are losing their battle with the majors. Under the guise of furthering the war effort—they cannot win.

In ordinary times they have been able to hold their heads above water.

The present battle is too great for them, just as it would be too great for any other group of American businessmen.

You gentlemen from the oil States know the details of the pattern better than I do. You can supply all the figures—the facts with which to paint the very, very dreary picture which confronts us.

The basic objectives of the major oil companies are here—they have been accomplished.

IN CALIFORNIA HEAVY PETROLEUM REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT BEING MET

In California, where I am somewhat familiar with conditions, since my State depends upon the oil fields of California for her petroleum products, conditions are growing continually worse.

There, in August, the demand for petroleum products reached 982,516 barrels daily.

Production was 138,226 barrels daily short of meeting requirements.

This demanded a withdrawal from storage supplies of 4,611,000 barrels.

The debit figures are mounting.

They are mounting because the independents have been prevented from going out and drilling wells in areas where they believe they are most certain to find additional sources of petroleum.

They have had to set aside their plans for drilling properties which are most probably producing areas.

They have been discouraged from bringing in new wells from these areas—new wells which would bring in new supplies of oil and add to the credit side of the ledger.

OIL PROSPECTING DISCOURAGED

Rather, they have been forced by the coordinators to go out on the wildest of wildcat ventures in their search for new supplies.

And since they sincerely want to further the war effort, they have done this.

In the first 9 months of 1943 the California operators, most of them independents, have completed 1,048 wells.

This figure is 115.6 percent above the figure for 1942.

But still production is too low.

And it will get lower.

The independents cannot be expected to invest their capital in losing ventures forever.

When they are coordinated into bankruptcy, that is the end; that is when the majors take over.

With our dwindling supplies, it may be the time for Hitler and Hirohito to take over.

THE EFFECT OF OIL ON THE WAR

Oil is going to decide this war.

To win that decision, we need every bit of oil we can draw from the ground. That means we need the all-out assistance of both the majors and the independents.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman is making a very excellent statement. I know that the gentleman is very much concerned not only about the present war which we must win very largely with supplies of oil from the west coast, but also that there be available in storage underground, that can be withdrawn at some future time, sufficient oil for any further conflict that may occur in the Pacific some 25 or 50 years after this war.

Mr. COFFEE. Unquestionably. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Therefore, by withdrawing it at the present rate we are jeopardizing the future, not only of the west coast, but of the country. Nevertheless we do not protest the present withdrawals, even though they are exceedingly heavy considering the amount of oil in the ground.

Mr. COFFEE. We have full realization of the dangers in the future because of excessive withdrawals at the present time.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I shall be happy to yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Washington upon his presentation of the subject matter, which he is so thoroughly discussing. He has been in the fight for a long time, on behalf of the consumer and the independent against the monopolies in the oil industry. He has been giving the House today information of tremendous value, of which I hope my colleagues will take full heed.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for his gracious statement. He has, himself, been in the forefront of this crusade and has helped me tremendously on many occasions in bringing out the true facts and in revealing the machinations of the oil monopoly.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman from Washington is doing a good job. For years he has been performing admirably in the fight against monopoly, especially in the field of oil. I hope he will continue, undeterred and unafraid, regardless of pressures. There is no more important undertaking for all of us members of Congress than to array ourselves against the encroachments of monopolies in all of their various manifestations, particularly the most gigantic of all, the oil monopoly.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the helpful comments of the learned gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]. During the time he has served in Congress, he has distinguished himself as a fearless champion of independent business, of the consumer, and of the plain citizen. He has everlastingly been on the side of the independent in the oil industry and has placed the welfare of his country always above the thought of profit for any select group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I am pleased to yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have been listening to the enlightening speech you have been delivering and I compliment you upon the tone and content of your remarks. The information you have been presenting will arouse the country to the imperative need for prompt action by the Congress to end the control by monopoly of the oil industry. "It is time that Congress woke up to the dire prospect of world cartels controlling the business of the globe" and to the grim danger of all independents being snuffed out by the strangle hold of the oil monopoly and of similar monopolies in other fields. The gentleman from Washington has rendered a signal service to the Congress and to the country today, and on many previous occasions in his crusades to direct the salubrious light of publicity upon the maneuverings and machinations of the oil and other equally reprehensible monopolies.

Mr. COFFEE. It is inspiring to hear such encouraging words from a man of the high caliber of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], whose record in Congress has demonstrated his fearlessness and his forthright character in fighting always on the side of the independent businessman against monopoly and for fair play. The gentleman from California is a successful businessman in his own right, yet, understands the problem of the plain citizen and the humble of our land and believes in befriending the consumer and in resisting gigantic combines of every nature. I am pleased and proud to have this expression of support from the courageous statesman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman has spoken very ably about the plight of the oil industry with particular reference to independents. First of all I want to congratulate the gentleman on his fine speech and his thorough knowledge of

the subject. I doubt that anyone in the House knows more about the oil business than the gentleman now speaking. I heard the gentleman, and I was very much interested in his statement, speak about the enemies of the independent oil industry. Would the gentleman venture an opinion in which governmental agencies those enemies are now working to destroy this independent industry?

Mr. COFFEE. First of all I want to thank the gentleman for his generous and gracious compliment and reciprocate by saying the gentleman from South Carolina has distinguished himself through the years by his knowledge of the problems, particularly with reference to the legal aspects, of the oil industry. I want to congratulate him for the great fight he has made for truth in the oil industry. In further reference to the query of the gentleman I would say that the major oil companies are thoroughly entrenched in bureaucratic agencies of Government. In the War Production Board there are dozens of dollar-a-year men, former executives, still drawing pay from the major oil companies who are in possession of power. They are in the office of the Petroleum Administrator for War, which is headed by Ralph K. Davies, who draws a salary of \$47,500 from the Standard Oil Co. of California, while at the same time getting a salary from the taxpayers of \$10,000.

This makes a total of \$57,500. That man is in charge of the Petroleum Administration for War, in which position he is empowered to make decisions vitally affecting the welfare and continued solvency of the competitors of the Standard Oil Co. of California and associated major oil companies. So I think that major oil company influence penetrates the various agencies of government, but particularly the Petroleum Administration for War and the War Production Board. The major integrated oil companies are also well represented by former or present executives of various segments of the oil monopoly in the War, Navy, State, and Commerce Departments.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the gentleman has hit the nail squarely on the head.

Mr. COFFEE. If I may be permitted to continue—I welcome these interruptions, because they bring out points I may have overlooked—

To get the help of the independents we must step in now and put an end to the very unfair, very one-sided civil war which rages within the industry.

It is nothing short of our immediate duty to put an end to the committees whose only usefulness, under the guise of furthering the war effort, is to kill off the independent producer and with him kill off his vital share of oil production to win the war.

It is our duty as Members of Congress, representatives of the people, lawmakers of the Nation.

However, I have every fear that it is too late—that the major oil companies have finally completed the one big objective that is basic indeed.

THE FOLLY OF SUSPENDING THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS

That is the setting aside of the Sherman antitrust laws. They are now in

the enviable position of making most any type of manipulation without running afoul of the rules and regulations which for years have given some medium of protection for the independent, the small businessman.

I speak of Petroleum Directive No. 70, issued by the Petroleum Administrator for War, the coordinator, on September 24, 1943.

You lawmakers of Congress should be interested in this new law for the Nation. As Members of Congress, who daily assemble in these legislative halls, I think it is only right that we be kept abreast of what new laws have been promulgated by the board members—if only for our own personal protection.

PETROLEUM DIRECTIVE NO. 70

I read of this latest law, passed not by Congress, but decided upon by the board members, and, I suppose, no doubt, under the guise of furthering the war effort, in a dispatch from the Office of War Information—a useful institution to keep this lawmaking body informed on recent, new legislation, among its other worth-while functions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a very interesting and informative address, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to continue for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. I am quoting from Petroleum Directive No. 70, issued by Harold Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, through the person of Ralph K. Davies, who is the acting, and for all practical purposes, the real Petroleum Administrator for War:

It is short, let me read it to you:

Foreign operations of American oil companies during the war emergency will be more completely coordinated—

Following again along the coordination line as expressed in Basic Objectives—

under the terms of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued today by Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes.

Upon a study of the document, this new law passed by the Board, I am convinced that even "coordinated" now becomes an outmoded word.

Though the Standard Oil Co. officials call it "a horrid word," "cartelized" would be the more fitting term because that is what Directive 70 does.

The cartel is complete.

UNCLE SAM SANCTIFIES OIL INDUSTRY CARTELIZATION

The oil industry can now be more completely cartelized, production can be controlled, markets may be doled out to favorites and consumer prices can be manipulated to the complete satisfaction of the Board.

As I see it, the steps are simple.

First. You have a war, the efforts of which are to be furthered.

Second. You arrange to coordinate all efforts under the guise of furthering that war effort, and then thirdly, when the initial coordination is complete, you cartelize the industry. Presto, the war effort has been a success.

A CUTE ARRANGEMENT BENEFICIAL TO OIL MAJORS

Here is how it works:

A foreign operations committee is empowered to determine the oil needs of the foreign country or area to be supplied and report to the Director, the Petroleum Administrator for War. In other words, they are going to find out about the market, the number of customers, and so forth. Then the Director, presumably acting upon the advice of the major oil company board and his major oil company assistant, who as I have said, is more often than not the acting director, with his order list already in hand, prepares to make the sales.

In simpler language, the major oil companies, after talking it over among themselves, decide which company will get this and that market.

It works the other way around, too, because the same committee has control over imports of foreign oil into the United States. The Board has not overlooked a thing.

And, to make certain it works, transportation is to be arranged with the War Shipping Administration.

They did that in 1941, when two companies in the United States agreed with the Japanese Government that they would increase the sale of petroleum to Japan commencing May 15, 1941, by 450 percent. Those two agreements were entered into by two major American oil companies, 7 months before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Was one of those major companies the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Mr. COFFEE. No. It was the Standard Vacuum Oil Co. of New York and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey who, together with their English affiliates divided the entire export products of the Dutch East Indies and agreed with the Japanese Government to sell them 450 percent more oil. In other words, they increased the quota which Japan had theretofore been receiving from 400,000 tons of petroleum products per year, exported from the Dutch East Indies to Japan. They agreed on May 15, 1941, to increase that amount from 400,000 tons to 1,800,000 tons during the year then next ensuing. That was less than 7 months before Pearl Harbor. The cute part of it was that the Japanese Government, in consideration of the generous willingness of these companies to deal with them, agreed with them that they would import the oil in British bottoms rather than in Japanese bottoms. In other words, part of the consideration

was the profit to be received by the English companies on their tanker ships sailing under the English flag.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know whether our Government has knowledge of that?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes, it did. And the British Government had knowledge of it. The State Department insisted that it had followed the urgings of the British Foreign Office in okaying that arrangement. That was brought out before the Rules Committee in June 1941, at the time my House Joint Resolution No. 30 to investigate the facts anent the sale of war material to the Axis Powers and their affiliates had hearings on 3 successive days. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Assistant Secretary of State and still is, told that to the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. About that time the gentleman will recall a number of Members of the House made some protests.

Mr. COFFEE. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. STEFAN. Regarding critical materials going to Japan. Some of it was raw material—chrome from the Philippine Islands. It was stated at that time that the Philippine Legislature was willing to stop the exportation of this critical material to the Japanese, but they were prevented from doing so because of some interference here in the United States.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That matter was discussed and brought to the attention of the committee by several Members of the House of Representatives at the time the gentleman mentions?

Mr. COFFEE. It was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman knows how deeply I appreciate his valiant work in trying to protect America against this monopoly. It is my judgment that it is at least one of two or three of our greatest problems as to our future democracy in this country. Does the gentleman believe there is any solution of the Elk Hills reserve petroleum which will really protect the public interest and the future defense of our country, except the acquisition of the Standard Oil Co. holdings by the Navy Department, so that it can be in truth a reserve?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree absolutely with the gentleman's conclusion. I was happy to note that the distinguished gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] made that statement in the press yesterday. In my judgment you cannot deal with that outfit unless you absolutely own the land. Whenever you deal with them it is like trying to deal with somebody who has the plague. You are bound to catch some kind of infection which they exude or give out.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think if the gentleman will consult the new volume published by the State Department entitled: "Peace and War" he will find that the program of supplying petroleum products to Japan was a part of the policy of the United States at that time, and as I read it the policy was for the purpose of preventing Japan from committing an overt act in order to obtain oil at a time when the world was not ready to have them do it.

Mr. COFFEE. I agree with the gentleman as to the State Department attitude, though I have always vigorously opposed appeasement of Japan in any form. I might say I am rather familiar with that whole policy because, as some of you may recall, I was one of the most active Members in the fight to interdict the sale of war materials to Japan, with particular reference to oil, along with a great many Members on the Republican and Democratic sides. I introduced the first bill in Congress to prohibit shipments of war materials specifically to Japan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished and erudite gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman presented all those facts to the Rules Committee at that time when he appeared in support of his resolution asking that the House investigate and determine the amount and the quantity and financial value of material being sent to Japan. Hearings were held by the Rules Committee and the State Department opposed consideration of the resolution at that time largely on the ground just suggested by the gentleman from California.

Mr. COFFEE. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Michigan interjecting his recollections in my speech at this point because I well recall how ably the gentleman from Michigan at that time brought out what he regarded as the signal danger that then existed. The State Department did take the attitude, I might say, from the very beginning that we were not in position to go to war with Japan and contended that were we to stop the sale of these supplies to Japan, principally oil, it would precipitate war immediately.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows that oil was stopped by State Department order on the 1st day of August in 1941 and that we were attacked 4 months and 7 days later.

Mr. COFFEE. I know that the Executive order was finally signed by the President late in July and that in August,

1941, was put into effect following the occupation of Thailand by the Japanese forces, although I might recall to the gentleman's mind that 1 year previously the President had signed an Executive order that provided that there should be no more shipment of high octane gasoline to Japan after July 30, 1940; but that order was freely violated, as I brought out before the Rules Committee and high-octane gasoline was shipped to Japan by special consent.

Mr. HINSHAW. By special permit of the State Department, was it not?

Mr. COFFEE. That is right, by special permit of the State Department.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would not the gentleman agree that it was done on the long-range policy of the major oil companies in the United States to build export trade in order to make certain that there would be no "oversupply" of oil in the United States?

Mr. COFFEE. Unquestionably that is the case. Because I think it would be interesting to you, I point out that Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, had been a private attorney until January 31, 1941. His law firm, which is still in operation in the city of Washington, D. C., had been general counsel for the Ethyl Corporation. The Ethyl Corporation manufactures high-octane gasoline. As you know, it sells first structure at about 1½ or 2 cents more than second structure, commonly denominated the "regular" gasoline.

Mr. Acheson in his capacity as a private lawyer had handled the case against the Government of the United States when Thurman Arnold, acting for the Department of Justice, sued the Ethyl Corporation on the ground that it was violating the Sherman antitrust law, and unlawfully conspiring to hold up the price of this ethyl gasoline. We find that thereafter the gentleman was—we will not say was rewarded—but just purely by coincidence we find this distinguished counsel for one of the major oil outfits in the United States being made Assistant Secretary of State. We also find another distinguished former official of the major oil companies, Gen. Pat Hurley—General Hurley bobs up in every administration, whether it is Republican or Democratic just as the oil industry bobs up in every political party whether it is Tea Pot Dome in Republican administrations, or dubious happenings in the Democratic administration. The barons of the major oil empire seem to be more powerful than political parties. Are they the invisible government? Now General Hurley has suddenly become so important that he is too good to be a brigadier general longer but is to become a major general—though General Hurley had been general counsel, and for all I know still is, of the Sinclair Oil Co. You will recall the Sinclair Oil Co. made the first settlement with the Government of Mexico and it came out ahead of all the other major oil companies in that deal.

I am sure all of you noticed the front page pictures of General Hurley chumming with the Arabian princes who recently visited our shores. General Hurley owns the Hurley-Wright building now rented by the United States Government on terms highly lucrative to the owner, for one of its agencies, so I am informed. General Hurley, we are advised, handled preliminary arrangements for the Teheran Conference. Persia, or Iran, embraces some of the richest oil fields in the world.

In this connection it would be pertinent to quote from the Wall Street Journal of October 21, 1943. It will be significantly noted that the author says that Federal officials are reluctant to discuss negotiations involving development of petroleum properties in the Middle East. Gentlemen, I wonder why? Is this more coordination? But let me read you this cryptic article. You form your own opinion:

OIL DIPLOMACY—UNITED STATES PLANS TO FINANCE PETROLEUM DEVELOPMENT IN ARABIA AND IRAN—GOVERNMENT TO PUT UP \$125,000,000 TO HELP EXPLOIT TEXAS-STANDARD PROPERTIES—WOULD AID THE BRITISH, TOO

(By George B. Bryant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Government is considering financing a large-scale development of petroleum properties in the Middle East.

Current negotiations are said to be running in two directions, one contemplating development of concessions held by American interests in Arabia and the other centering on expansion of British operations in Iraq and Iran.

The American interest involved is the Arabian concession of approximately a quarter million square miles owned jointly by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co. through the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. The British properties are held by the Anglo-Iranian interests.

Officials are reluctant to discuss the current negotiations, other than to acknowledge that they are in progress. There have been indications, however, that a decision on the development plans is not very far in the future.

GOVERNMENT'S PART NOT REVEALED

Just what part the Government will play in exploitation of the Middle East fields has not been revealed. The negotiations have been handled through the State Department insofar as Britain interests are concerned and by the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, an R. F. C. subsidiary created for development of foreign oil fields, on the American side.

The discussions with representatives of California Arabian are said to have involved two different financial arrangements. One of these called for a Government ownership in the company, to be acquired by the purchase of common stock. Under the other plan, the Government would provide the necessary facilities and take oil in repayment. The latter arrangement is said to have preference at this time.

The Arabian development, as it has been discussed here, would involve an outlay which might total about \$125,000,000. Facilities would include drilling, refining, housing, and transportation. Nothing has been disclosed on the reported discussions with the British interests.

The War Department makes a deal called the Canol project, whereby we are committed to go forward and spend

about \$130,000,000 plus, in Canada in connection with the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, Ltd., which is affiliated with American oil majors, as a result of which we invest a colossal quantity of the taxpayers' money. After the transaction has been completed, Canada gets the works and we get another kind of works.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I assume the gentleman was here yesterday and heard the Speaker of the House deliver a very instructive appeal to the people for unity, and calling attention to a dangerous trend if we questioned the British or the English?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has no idea that the mention of this Canadian oil exploration or this reference to post-war control of oil by the Standard Oil Co. and some of its English friends would run counter to that thought?

Mr. COFFEE. No, sir; I do not believe it will run counter to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not either, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. As a matter of fact, some members of the Canadian Parliament have deplored the Canol project as a secret build-up for a monopoly. The same arguments were advanced at Ottawa as by our distinguished Republican Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], and by certain other Members of this House in both parties. I commend them for their fearlessness in exposing the situation. There is nothing of a disunity nature about that. Both sides do not want the taxpayers' money turned over to private interests for these various projects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the talented gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. May I ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that there is a definite movement on foot in this country today to depress our local oil industry and to import oil after the war?

Mr. COFFEE. I am convinced such developments are in the offing and unless we intervene soon and courageously stop it, that is what will eventually happen.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the genial gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation in reply to the question just propounded?

Mr. COFFEE. I would be happy to have the attentive gentleman do so.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman from Washington is making a very splendid contribution. He is giving a warning to America. May I say in elaboration of your reply to the question, that Thurman Arnold was succeeded by Wendell Berge, who happens to be from my State, in the Antitrust Division. I would also like to sound a warning along the line suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] that, in my opinion, there is a very definite movement on foot in America to carry on American participation in the international cartels, as has been indicated in some of the philosophies propounded by certain American people that perhaps after the war we should surrender not only oil but many of our other things, such as our synthetic rubber plants in which we have \$750,000,000 invested. Synthetic rubber is made successfully from the by-products of petroleum, alcohol from molasses, and alcohol from grain, and timber and pulp mill wastes. We can produce synthetic rubber for 7 cents a pound in the post-war period. We will be making, at the end of 1944, 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber, which is more than we normally use in our country; yet I fear that American participation in international cartels will surrender and give to this Dutch-British monopoly the rubber market not only of the United States but of the world. The gentleman from Washington is giving the American people a warning which all of us should heed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that it is extremely important that we see that under the provisions of the U. N. R. A. appropriations our natural resources are not sent to other countries?

Mr. COFFEE. I am convinced our exhaustible natural resources should be husbanded and protected to the nth degree for the benefit of our own country and for the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is one of the things that we must guard against very carefully?

Mr. COFFEE. Absolutely, and I compliment the gentleman for her convictions on that subject.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I take it the gentleman would not subscribe to the philosophy that the best way to conserve our exhaustible natural resources would be to permit their control by a monopoly?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I call attention to the fact that 3 or 4 days ago I introduced a bill in the House

identical with one introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the Senate, which would require the registration of every agreement of any American corporation with a foreign corporation which is of a cartel nature, and the making of that information available to the Department of Justice and the public of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, my feeling is that Mr. Wendell Berge, of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice will cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. I, too, have absolute confidence in the integrity and ability of Wendell Berge.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I wish to compliment the gentleman, especially for his fight to keep oil from being sold to Japan. I recall when I came here in the early part of 1939 I entertained that same opinion and worked with the gentleman to some extent with reference to the matter. I well remember how hard the gentleman worked and how much even I tried to do as a new Member of Congress with reference to that. Of course, we can all see now that our failure to prohibit oil exports to Japan was a mistake, and that the gentleman who now has the floor was eminently correct.

Mr. COFFEE. I appreciate what the eloquent gentleman from Arkansas has said. I recall very distinctly that not only he but a great many Republican and Democratic Members of Congress did everything within their power to secure the passage by the Congress of legislation and also action by the executive departments which would have resulted in stopping the sale of oil and war materials to Japan.

With further reference to what the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska said about cartels, in my judgment, that is the greatest menace facing America today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. I believe the menace of cartels is the greatest cloud which hangs on the horizon of the United Nations today. In that connection I cite the statements made by Mr. Eric Johnston from my home State, the distinguished Republican president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in which he in speeches in England pointed out to them that free enterprise could not work hand in hand with the world cartel system. Therefore, he stated, if the English were going to foster world cartels he would have to differ with the English. To that statement I heartily subscribe.

The Bank for International Settlements, which was set up about 12 years ago, the home office of which is at Basel in Switzerland, which is on the German border, is operating actively today. The principal depositor of the Bank for International Settlements is the German Nazi Government, which has 85,000,000 Swiss gold francs on deposit; yet that same bank right now is the financial clearing-house for the International Red Cross and the American Red Cross.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman forgets that yesterday we were admonished that we were not to worry about what the English or the British Empire might do after the war was over.

Mr. COFFEE. I am talking about the cartels right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know, but that is fostered by the British Government. I am worried about it, and I was just wondering if the gentleman is worried about it.

Mr. COFFEE. I certainly believe in looking after our own interests to the best of our power.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So do I.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is a danger that has nothing to do with the British involved in what the gentleman just mentioned, which is the danger of another attempt on the part of the German cartelized industry once again to develop and to dominate by means of cartelization the industries of the world after this war just as they did to some extent after the First World War.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the American participation in international cartels there is much to worry about right here at home, as to who participates in them in America, with connections overseas.

Mr. COFFEE. That is right. There is no one who knows more about those developments and their dangers than KARL STEFAN, the very eminent and scholarly gentleman from Nebraska, who is so widely traveled and who is such a profound student of world history and such an accomplished linguist.

Further advertising to the Bank for International Settlements, I might point out that the head of that outfit is a man named Tom McKittrick, a partner of J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York City, who is right now the president of the Bank for International Settlements.

Interestingly enough, the majority of the board of directors of the Bank for International Settlements are German Nazi officials, yet that bank is functioning right along and American money is being deposited in the bank. These cartels get along regardless of whether wars are being fought between their re-

spective countries. These fellows seem to be bigger than their countries. They ignore their countries. They do not care who is fighting whom. They sit around the table together—Dr. Schacht, the great German financial expert; Montagu Norman, the great British financial expert; and Tom McKittrick, the great American financial expert. And that is just one of many which I hope to cite in a subsequent speech on the subject of cartels, the greatest menace facing the United Nations today.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has just mentioned the subject of disconnecting certain people from the Federal pay rolls. Does the gentleman know that Dean Acheson, whom you have just mentioned, is a member of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, which is today representing the three gentlemen Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, whom this Congress has tried, by its control of the pursestrings, to disconnect from the Government pay rolls?

Mr. COFFEE. So I have been advised from what I have read and what the gentleman has stated.

Mr. CHURCH. And Dean Acheson's law firm today is representing them in the Court of Claims?

Mr. COFFEE. That is the same law firm which has represented certain major oil companies.

COORDINATION TO THE NTH DEGREE

That there may be no slip up on the international side of the picture, the Foreign Operations Committee is directed to coordinate or cartelize its activities with the British Overseas Supply Committee.

Now we know that with the exception perhaps of the I. G. Farben and other German cartelizers, the British are the best at that particular game. So, complete cooperation can be expected.

The board will select the companies to import; they will select the companies to export.

And, they will select the companies—on both ends—which are to be the suppliers.

GOVERNMENT FOSTERED WORLD OIL MONOPOLY DEPLOYED

This arrangement, I think you will all agree, even out-Farbens the great I. G. Farben—a monopoly complete in every detail.

Again they have thrown it in our teeth. Though they operate under the cloak, under the protection, of the American flag, and are, I am sure, fully determined to further the war effort, Members of Congress have absolutely no control over them.

As a last resort, Congress has often had to abolish needless committees, unnecessary bureaucrats, by cutting them off at the pockets—that is refusing to make appropriations for salaries and other expense.

But not these lads under the wing of Directive 70.

BYPASSING CONGRESS

They have taken care to see that they will be perpetuated.

The order reads:

Operation expenses of all such committees shall be made from a fund to which voluntary contributions may be made by persons engaged in the petroleum industry and such funds may be solicited by the Foreign Operations Committee.

In other words, the Rockefellers will pass the hat among the other Rockefeller companies and their associated affiliates and enough dimes will be collected, you may rest assured, to keep the cartel rolling.

The perfect monopoly—the perfect cartel, every single phase opposed to our ideas of fair business practices as expressed in the Sherman antitrust laws—yet it is the law.

How will it affect the independent oilman?

How would it affect any other industry in which the large and powerful interests have complete control of exports and imports and domestic markets?

With the exception of perhaps some small favorable, temporary condition—it will kill the independent.

It will kill off the independent competition just the same as it would kill off the small manufacturer, the small mining enterprise or the small farm cooperative if faced with similar conditions.

How will it affect the consumers of the Nation?

I need not tell you that prices can and will be regulated once we see this new cartel in full bloom—once, under the guise of furthering the war effort, the monopolists have time fully to explore their opportunities.

DANGERS OF OIL CARTEL ARE ITS INVITATION TO INSTITUTE SIMILAR PRACTICES IN OTHER FIELDS

It is now the time for this Congress to decide upon not only the immediate oil problem as it concerns the war, but as it concerns the basic concepts of business economics.

Shall we shelve the Sherman antitrust laws and allow this new monopoly, this new cartel to stand?

Let me shout the warning:

If we do—if we do not now raise our hands and our voices and our votes—while we still have them, against this giant octopus which is crawling over our land in the guise of furthering the war effort, it will spread its tentacles out and overwhelm other great industries. When it does, small business will go the way the independent oil man is about now to go.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. May I ask the majority leader to give us an idea of next week's program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to.

On Monday the discharge petition will come up on the oil bill. Then we have the matter coming out of the Appropria-

tions Committee relating to farm labor. There will be other legislation, but there is nothing definite that I can advise the gentleman from Michigan about now or advise the House. There is a supplemental appropriation bill which will go to conference. If they agree, of course that will come up. If the mustering out bill comes out we will bring that up just as quickly as possible after it is reported by the committee which is proceeding in consideration of that bill.

I understand that legislation is before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in connection with relief and rehabilitation and that the committee meets on Wednesday next. If that is reported out, which is doubtful, next week we may be able to bring it up, but the chances are, and this is my own personal opinion, that the bill probably will not be in order for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. The farm-security item to which the gentleman referred is included in an appropriation bill that is over in the Senate and coming back on a conference report?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no; the bill is coming out of our committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Coming directly from our own committee? Is there not an appropriation bill to come from the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, there is a deficiency bill. There is a bill over there. I do not know if it is the farm-security deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. My understanding is that the bill in the Senate has been materially changed since it has left the House and many of the items included in the Senate bill will be most controversial in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some of them will, I understand.

Mr. MICHENER. The possibilities are that the bill will take some little time and probably cause some roll calls in the House next week. I speak of this because if it is true the Members ought to know it.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but that if that bill comes up next week in the House, and it will, assuming it goes to conference and the conferees make a report, there are a number of controversial features and there will undoubtedly be roll calls.

Mr. MICHENER. Could the distinguished majority leader give us any information with reference to the completion of work before Christmas? A great many Members are asking the question. I know how difficult it is to answer. I do not expect an absolute answer, but is there a goal to be aimed at?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very difficult question to answer. At the present time, unless something develops, I think we will be in session after Christmas. I am sorry to say it; but, unless something unexpected develops, I cannot see but what we will have to be in session after Christmas.

Mr. MICHENER. You mean for the rest of this session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Just how long after Christmas I cannot say. The

Commodity Credit Corporation bill has to be disposed of. There is no question about that. It is not out of committee yet. It has to be debated in the Senate and then it has to go through the final processes. If there are any amendments over there, they will have to be presented and the bill sent to the President. I cannot say what action will be taken there; but, assuming the bill is vetoed, it then has to come back; and if the veto is sustained, then we have certainly got to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because, no matter how Members may feel on the question of the use of subsidies, I think we are practically unanimously in favor of the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I know I am.

Mr. MICHENER. The debate in the House on the subsidy bill made it clear that there was unanimity of opinion, so far as the Members of the House were concerned, on that item.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. If a resolution were brought in here just continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation temporarily, there should be no question about it being passed at once, unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. There should be no question about it. I was hopeful, though those hopes have more or less disappeared, that the Commodity Credit Corporation might be extended for a limited period beyond the first of the year, and then let the pending legislation go through the regular legislative processes. But apparently that developed into a disappointing hope.

Mr. MICHENER. Which we regret.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman take some more time? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask for 1 additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us anything about when the vote permitting the soldiers to vote will come?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I wish I could, because I am absolutely in favor of a bill that will enable the soldiers and sailors to vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I guess we all are, but it is a matter of detail how to do it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, but I do not want any administration or bureaucrat to vote them. I want them to vote. That is all. I do not want to make a speech about that. I want to ask another question. As I get it, we are going to have a very, very busy week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that following along the general plan of the commandos of the drive for action committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman an advocate of the so-called commandos?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not a member in good standing. I have not paid any dues or special assessments or signed on the dotted line, but I am in favor of action ordinarily. The gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always interested in listening to the observations of my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Even on occasions—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even when there is nothing to it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement by a representative of the National Educational Association to a group of Congressmen yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial from a Mobile paper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a speech by the distinguished Catholic bishop, Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. I find on examination of the manuscript that it exceeds the quota. I have received a statement from the Government Printing Office that it would cost \$120. Notwithstanding that I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address recently delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a poem in memory of our late colleague, Lawrence Lewis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative program for the day and other special orders, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted leave of absence for Monday and Tuesday, December 13 and 14 next, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DILWEG, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARNES of Indiana, for 3 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. OUTLAND (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 296. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 878. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Dradshaw; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1233. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1372. An act to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians by authorizing the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building known as

the Telephone and Telegraph Building located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington, a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 13, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

APRIL 7, 1943.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, JOHN E. RANKIN, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 29) entitled "A resolution to amend clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress," which was referred to said committee January 6, 1943, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. J. E. Rankin.
2. Marion T. Bennett.
3. Bernard W. Kearney.
4. Fred E. Busbey.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James Domengeaux.
7. J. Hardin Peterson.
8. Thomas G. Abernethy.
9. A. Leonard Allen.
10. Earle D. Willey.
11. Edith Nourse Rogers.
12. Grant Furlong.
13. Homer D. Angell.
14. James H. Fay.
15. Norris Poulson.
16. Robert B. Chipfield.
17. Jay LeFevre.
18. Michael J. Bradley.
19. Compton I. White.
20. Charles M. LaFollette.

21. Thomas J. Lane.
 22. Charles B. Hoeven.
 23. James C. Auchincloss.
 24. Emory H. Price.
 25. Carl Hinshaw.
 26. C. W. Bishop.
 27. John Edward Sheridan.
 28. Albert J. Engel.
 29. Henry P. Jeffrey.
 30. Ranulf Compton.
 31. Harold C. Hagen.
 32. Angier L. Goodwin.
 33. William J. Miller.
 34. Merlin Hull.
 35. Ivor D. Fenton.
 36. Chet Holifield.
 37. Maurice J. Sullivan.
 38. A. M. Fernandez.
 39. Charles A. Wolverton.
 40. Leo E. Allen.
 41. Evan Howell.
 42. Joseph R. Bryson.
 43. Harry L. Towe.
 44. Joseph P. O'Hara.
 45. Paul H. Maloney.
 46. Wm. H. Wheat.
 47. Paul W. Shafer.
 48. Ben F. Jensen.
 49. Ralph E. Church.
 50. Thomas D'Alessandro, Jr.
 51. Victor Wickersham.
 52. John M. Robison.
 53. William A. Rowan.
 54. William I. Troutman.
 55. John Phillips.
 56. Charles R. Clason.
 57. Walter E. Brehm.
 58. L. C. Arends.
 59. Chauncey W. Reed.
 60. Anton J. Johnson.
 61. Stephen A. Day.
 62. Wm. W. Blackney.
 63. Richard M. Simpson.
 64. Martin Gorski.
 65. Thomas S. Gordon.
 66. Robert F. Rockwell.
 67. Thomas J. O'Brien.
 68. Reid F. Murray.
 69. Henry C. Dworshak.
 70. Tom Murray.
 71. John P. Newsome.
 72. Jim McCord.
 73. James V. Heidinger.
 74. Fred Norman.
 75. Harris Ellsworth.
 76. Daniel Ellison.
 77. Sid Simpson.
 78. Henry O. Talle.
 79. Paul Stewart.
 80. Ross Rizley.
 81. Fred C. Gilchrist.
 82. D. Lane Powers.
 83. Mike Mansfield.
 84. Walt Horan.
 85. B. Carroll Reece.
 86. Harry Sauthoff.
 87. Bob Sikes.
 88. James A. Wright.
 89. Harve Tibbott.
 90. Richard J. Welch.
 91. A. C. Schiffer.
 92. Pat Cannon.
 93. Joe Hendricks.
 94. Edw. J. Hart.
 95. Foster Stearns.
 96. James W. Mott.
 97. Fadjo Cravens.
 98. Karl E. Mundt.

99. W. F. Norrell.
 100. John Jennings, Jr.
 101. Aime J. Forand.
 102. E. C. Gathings.
 103. John L. McMillan.
 104. Howard Buffett.
 105. Ray J. Madden.
 106. John W. Murphy.
 107. John M. Coffee.
 108. Everett M. Dirksen.
 109. J. Glenn Beall.
 110. Joe B. Bates.
 111. Richard F. Harless.
 112. B. W. Gearhart.
 113. Alvin E. O'Konski.
 114. Edwin A. Hall.
 115. Henry D. Larcade, Jr.
 116. Lyle H. Boren.
 117. Usher L. Burdick.
 118. John E. Fogarty.
 119. Wm. Lemke.
 120. Joseph Mruk.
 121. Karl Stefan.
 122. Jed Johnson.
 123. William S. Hill.
 124. Philip J. Philbin.
 125. Louis E. Miller.
 126. W. P. Elmer.
 127. J. Leroy Johnson.
 128. Wesley E. Disney.
 129. Joseph E. Talbot.
 130. Noble J. Johnson.
 131. Frank B. Keefe.
 132. Oren Harris.
 133. F. Edw. Hébert.
 134. C. E. McKenzie.
 135. Arthur Winstead.
 136. John S. Gibson.
 137. William C. Cole.
 138. Brooks Hays.
 139. Max Schwabe.
 140. John D. McWilliams.
 141. Wirt Courtney.
 142. Edward O. McCowen.
 143. Gerald W. Landis.
 144. Estes Kefauver.
 145. Frank Fellows.
 146. John B. Bennett.
 147. John R. Murdock.
 148. James H. Morrison.
 149. Edward H. Rees.
 150. Thomas A. Jenkins.
 151. James F. O'Connor.
 152. Dewey Short.
 153. Frank Carlson.
 154. Clarence Cannon.
 155. John M. Vorys.
 156. W. P. Lambertson.
 157. Alvin F. Weichel.
 158. Mike Monroney.
 159. Earl R. Lewis.
 160. Henderson H. Carson.
 161. Ed Rowe.
 162. Homer A. Ramey.
 163. Joseph J. O'Brien.
 164. William T. Byrne.
 165. Fred Bradley.
 166. Carl T. Curtis.
 167. Lawrence H. Smith.
 168. Orville Zimmerman.
 169. Overton Brooks.
 170. Matthew J. Merritt.
 171. Errett P. Scrivner.
 172. Francis E. Walter.
 173. Clair Engel.
 174. Jennings Randolph.
 175. Martin J. Kennedy.
 176. Melvin J. Maas.

177. James M. Curley.
 178. Louis Ludlow.
 179. L. Mendel Rivers.
 180. Cecil R. King.
 181. John H. Tolan.
 182. L. H. Gavin.
 183. George E. Outland.
 184. D. K. Hoch.
 185. Dan R. McGehee.
 186. Robert L. Rodgers.
 187. Francis J. Myers.
 188. Pehr G. Holmes.
 189. George J. Bates.
 190. R. B. Wigglesworth.
 191. Christian A. Herter.
 192. A. Sidney Camp.
 193. Thomas Byron Miller.
 194. Charles A. Plumley.
 195. J. W. Fulbright.
 196. N. M. Mason.
 197. Chester H. Gross.
 198. Cliff Clevenger.
 199. Winifred Stanley.
 200. Aug H. Andresen.
 201. E. G. Rohrbough.
 202. Hubert S. Ellis.
 203. Chester E. Merrow.
 204. H. C. Fuller.
 205. George H. Bender.
 206. D. Emmert Brumbaugh.
 207. Walter C. Ploeser.
 208. Warren G. Magnuson.
 209. Roy O. Woodruff.
 210. Harry R. Sheppard.
 211. Frank A. Barrett.
 212. Lindley Beckworth.
 213. George G. Sadowski.
 214. Earl Wilson.
 215. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
 216. W. Sterling Cole.
 217. Francis Case.
 218. Ward Johnson.

This motion was entered upon the Journal, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, December 10, 1943.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Public Lands Committee on Monday, December 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); with amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3405. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3760. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3826. A bill to require the approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of all disposals and acquisitions of real property or interests therein by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3827. A bill to authorize the acceptance of certain land as a gift to the United States from Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3828. A bill to aid the program for the conservation of food; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Robert Zane Collings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of the Citizens State Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Domenico Buccì; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Anthony Galbreath; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4013. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ray H. Fleming and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4014. Also, petition of Laurence Gottschamer and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4015. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, and signed by 30 other

St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4016. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 293 residents of the county of Butler, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which advocates socialized medicine; also objecting to the control of the Office of Price Administration over the sale of the farmers' products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4017. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Myrtle Van Horn and 26 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4018. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Baker Confectionery Store, of Auburn, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4019. Also, petition of the Slovak Catholic Association, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4020. Also, petition of Laurier-Pooler Restaurant, of Fairfield, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4021. Also, petition of the Lemelin Market, of Fairfield, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4022. Also, petition of the Blair Restaurant, Waterville, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4023. Also, petition of the Elks Club, of Lewiston, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4024. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the town of Lisbon, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4025. Also, petition of the Greek Catholic Association, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4026. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary W. F. Speers, petitioning Congress to impeach the Honorable Arthur J. Tuttle, United States district judge, for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 7, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer.

Eternal God, spirit of light and truth, of beauty and freedom and of joy, behold us a company of seekers for the highest, for we, too, in exalted hours have seen Thy Star. Although earthborn clouds sometimes obscure its guiding beacon, yet our eager eyes are fixed on the lighted heavens even as we travel over desert sands. Lift our duty above drudgery. Let not our strength fail or the vision splendid fade in the heat and burden of the day. O God, who as an understanding Father pitieth Thy children, make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way.

Forgive us, O Lord, if we hurt our fellow souls. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world. Give us courage for the day and hope for the morrow. Day unto day may we lay hold of Thy hand and look up into Thy face, whatever befall, until our work is finished and we hear far voices out of darkness calling through an open door to another room in the Father's many-mansioned house. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS FOR JUDGES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and also at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, who will hold the hearings I am about to announce, I give notice that on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., in the Judiciary Committee room in the United States Capitol, a public hearing will be held on the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; on the nomination of Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii; on the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Terri-